DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 841 SP 029 495

AUTHOR Neil, Roger
TITLE The Integration of Curriculum and Teacher Development (1890-1990): Roots and Rationale.
PUB DATE Jun 87
NOTE 84p.; Paper presented at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, May 31-June 3, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; *Educational History; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This paper considers how the metamorphosis of the curriculum movement from 1890-1990 relates to teacher education practices in the corresponding time period, with particular attention given to inservice teacher education. Part 1 briefly describes the history of curriculum change, part 2 highlights the history of inservice teacher education, and part 3 depicts how the two activities have met in the past. Lastly, part 4 considers the implications of current research and practice on curriculum and teacher development. It is concluded that six methods can be implemented to facilitate the integrated development of curriculum and inservice teacher education: reading circles, collegial supervision practices, classroom demonstrations and observations, workshops, action research, and teacher centers. Appended are extensive references and an historical overview of major changes in the meaning of curriculum. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED287841

THE INTEGRATION OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHER DEVELOPMENT (1890-1990) - ROOTS AND RATIONALE

(an address to the Canadian Society for Studies in Education)

Nipissing University College
Faculty of Education
Box 5002, Gormanville Road
North Bay, Ontario, P1B 8L7

Roger Neil, Ph.D.
(705) 474-3450

June 3, 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 029 495

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Neil

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		
PART ONE	The History of Curriculum Change	1-6
PART TWO	Inservice Teacher Education - Historical Highlights	7-14
PART THREE	The Integration of Curriculum and Teacher Development (1890-1980)	15-26
	- Synopsis	
PART FOUR	Back to the Future: Implications of Current Research and Practice on the Evolution of Curriculum and Teacher Development	27-36
	- What is Integration in the 1980's?	
	- Current Forces in Education and their Possible Impact on CURRICULUM/TEACHER Development	
	- Conclusion: Concrete Methods of Integration for the Future	
REFERENCES		37-46

APPENDIX I Major Changes in the Meaning of Curriculum

APPENDIX II A Chronology of the Inte-gration of Curriculum and Inservice Teacher Education

APPENDIX III Kinds of Inservice Teacher Education

INTRODUCTION

The term "curriculum" has held quite divergent meanings to educators of the last one hundred years. This paper is an effort to discover how the metamorphosis of the curriculum movement stands in relation with teacher education practises in the corresponding time period. How inservice teacher education, in particular, relates to the curriculum field, will be studied because little school curriculum is developed, implemented or evaluated during preservice experiences.

The author will make an earnest effort to avoid pitfalls or evangelism, parochialism, and factual isolation (Cremin, 1965, p.43; Brickman, 1982) in this effort to describe the correlative history of teacher and curriculum development. The author is also sensitive to the need for a coherent study of trends by education scholars (Bailyn, 1981) and the complex quality of such trends (Gaffield, 1986, pp.115-116).

Part one will briefly describe the history of curriculum change; part two will seek to highlight the history of inservice teacher education; part three will depict how the two activities have met in the past. Lastly, part four will then consider the implications of current research and practise on curriculum and teacher development.

PART ONE

The Changing Meaning of the Term "Curriculum"

A necessary step in thinking about curriculum change appears to the author as that of distinguishing between education and curriculum. Among curriculum writers there has been wide agreement that education is a dynamic process, with three fundamental sources: the student, the subject-matter, and society (Dewey, 1902, pp.4, 11, 12; Rugg, 1927, pp.19-20; Bode, 1939, p.82; Taba, 1945, p.83; Herrick, 1950, p.113; Cremin, 1964, Chapter IV; Joyce and Weil, 1972, Schiro, 1978, p.313; Schubert, 1980, pp.15-24).

But within this broad consensus as to the definition of educational processes there has yet been considerable change in the shades and depths of meaning given to the term curriculum during the last century. These changes will next be briefly regarded within five time frames, and detailed in Appendix One.

1. The 1890's to 1920.

   Materialization of Curriculum. From the mid-1800's to the 1920's most additions to American curricula were in the form of texts, labs, gymnasia, as well as instruments for mathematics, the sciences, vocational education, and home economics. It would be fair to say that curricular endeavours, until the 1920's typically materialized a greater quantity and wider scope of educational "staples" that were demanded by the great increase in school attendance.

2. The 1920's to the 1940's.

Curriculum as Experience. During the 1920's, through the 1940's, while curriculum materials were still being produced for elementary then secondary levels, many educators remarked upon the poignancy of daily classroom life, and the vital nature of the "educational moment". Progressive respect for individual worth and integrity of purpose was fused with advances in psychology which had uncovered developmental growth and physiological grounds for individual differences.

3. The 1950's.

Fallow Decade. The 1950's could be regarded as a "fallow" decade in curriculum. It has been described variously as a time of "consolidating gains" in an atmosphere of "consensus among educators; or as a period of "un-committed, stagnant opinion". During this era, the baby-boom demanded material construction rather than curriculum reconstruction. In America, six times as many buildings arose to meet a 33% increase in students and six times as many teachers.

4. The 1960's.

Bifurcated Curriculum. Public pressure for measured intellectual accomplishment corresponded with a bifurcation of curriculum endeavours in the 1960's. Curriculum-as-experience paled on the one hand to behavioural objectives and systems management approaches in schooling practices, and on the other hand toward growing understanding and respect for the structure of the disciplines.

5. The 1970's.

Values in Curriculum. In contrast with the behavioural positivism that had begun to frame the field, the theme of human values in curriculum interfused much of the curriculum writing of the 1970's. This deep commitment to human values arose in opposition to the 1960's large-scale "top-down" curriculum practices that had mass-produced material and minimized the existence of experiential free-choice. Schwab's "practical". Walker's "deliberation", Macdonald's "underlying human interests", Huebner's "just environment", Stenhouse's "cultural cultivation", and Cronbach's "decision-oriented inquiry"--all voiced the importance of reflective human values in curriculum.

PART TWO

Inservice Teacher Education

Historical Highlights

While this paper will focus upon past North American inservice practices, it is noteworthy that European inservice education began with regular teachers' seminars in Halle, Germany, 1706 (Taylor, 1978).

There are many reasons why North American teacher education remained unevolved throughout most of the 1800's: the simple agricultural life of the time; absence of cities; the isolation and independence of people; revolutionary war costs; few industries; poorly developed trade; lack of full suffrage; the "westernization" process required of immigrants to survive (Cubberley, 1920, p.656; Patterson, 1976, p.10-26). Typically, the American common school teacher (elementary) of the 1800's had themself merely graduated from a common school setting. Into the late 1800's certificates of fitness by provincial or state governments assured the public only that the teacher could write, calculate some mathematics, and was considered of sound morals (Lazerte, 1951, p.18).

In the early 1800's in America there were few even modestly educated teachers. Many teachers of that era had only a superficial grasp of english and mathematics, and they were regarded as generally incapable of reflecting upon and improving their own teaching (Tyack, 1967, p.415). However, private Academies often became training schools for new teachers. For this reason they were sometimes termed "model schools", as were county schools in which the more studious students could imitate their instructors for a six to fourteen week period (Cubberley, 1920, p.656; Love, 1978, p.113; Johnson,

1968). By 1890, the term "Model School" became associated with Columbia's post-graduate courses in education (Pangburn, 1932, p.26).

Also in the 1890's, the United States was beginning to recover from the Civil War, and Teachers' Institutes were formed to up-grade common school teachers in their understanding of subject matter. The Teachers' Institutes served a stop-gap function in giving temporary relief to the pressing needs for teacher upgrading, before Normal Schools gained acceptance (Richey, 1957, p.42).

Krug (1972, p.158-161) describes five kinds of inservice education that came to life at the turn of the century:

1. the institute - which was a convention of one to three days in duration to which inspirational speakers in education gave invited addresses. Teacher attendance was considered mandatory.
2. reading circles - cooperative groups of teachers formed under a provincial teachers association or state department of instruction. The group bought approved books, discussed them and often wrote and shared reaction papers. These circles were semi-voluntary in nature, and were encouraged by certification renewal and upgrading.
3. Summer School - entailed both general study and courses in the education field. Small town teachers often enjoyed the experience of college or university liberalism, and life in a larger centre. While some coursework was demanded by local superintendents, much was purely voluntary.

The ancestry of the Summer School might be traced to the Chautaugua, Sunday School Retreat or camp meetings.

4. Supervision - was primarily aimed at correcting teachers' defects. This usually took place at the elementary level by the superintendent or his supervisors. High school supervision was managed by the principal through Class "visitations" and discussions. During the nineteen-thirty's and forty's the aim of supervision changed complexion toward inspiration rather than inspection.

5. Classroom observation/demonstration - Monroe (1913, p.520) adds that another common inservice education practise took place as teachers intervisited one another's classrooms. Particular success apparently derived from the visiting teacher's focus upon distinct aspects of the class.

A few districts even offered teachers interested in professional development a sabbatical year with half pay (Monroe, 1913, p.520). However, little inservice could have developed along any of these lines had not Provincial and State Normal schools for teacher training been made compulsory between 1850 and 1905 (Lazerte, 1951, p.20-21). Conversely, in many cases, inservice courses served as precursors of Normal School coursework. In a sense, the summer schools and reading circles were testing trials for Education curriculum at the Normals (Harris, 1976, p.25-26).

The first government controlled Normal School in North America was opened in Montreal in 1836 (Lazerte, 1951, p.19). In the United States, Horace Mann inspired many fellow citizens to regard teacher Normal Schools

as the mainspring of the whole public school system that he had vigorously advocated. By 1846 the first publically-funded Normal School was established at Bridgewater, Massachussetts, and from the late 1800's until about 1920 a "quantitative expansion" took place in the whole field of teacher education (Axtelle, 1940, pp.32-33).

As the Normal Schools began to graduate teachers, these teachers travelled throughout the country, often speaking at Teachers' Institutes. Soon, the typical subject-content review of the Institutes began to be thereby displaced by an emphasis on methods and pedagogic principles. Inservice that had been aimed at fulfilling basic needs of backward systems and poorer teachers became vastly improved. By the 1920's inservice also included Summer Normal Schools, evening extension courses, local teachers' reading circles, classroom supervision and consultation, and correspondence courses (Richey, 1957, pp.43-52). Thus, a previously narrow inservice emphasis on limited subject matter expanded to include cultural expression, pedagogy, specialist councils in vocation education, art, music, and home education, as well as management according to "scientific" principles and the provision of distance education (Harris, 1976, p.180).

By the 1920's, admission requirements in Normal Schools had risen, and by 1930 a high school certificate was required to enter teaching training college. From the mid-twenties until the 1940's, this growing professionalization, along with the burgeoning of psychological theories encouraged inservice to be conceived as an on-going research experiment (Schaefer, 1944), and to become less authoritatively managed, and more akin to guidance (Richey, 1957, p.58).

Also during this period (1920's-40's) teacher associations more frequently began to conduct intensive studies. Through the Normals, Teacher's Colleges and the new Departments of Education within Universities, fresh inservice curricula were made available. Along with methods in special subjects, curriculum organization, training of principals and administrators, supervision, philosophy and psychology were offered. These broadened course offerings were for the most part still at the undergraduate level (Kandel, 1966, p.36). School boards often subsidized such studies by bonuses, scholarships or increments in salary.

In many areas, teachers of the era were being asked to address significant socio-economic pressures of the times: scientific progress in radio and later television was dissolving provincialism, home and church cooperation were losing dominance, industrial growth became expansive while handcrafts were lost, as pride of production diminished; specialist roles were multiplying; political unrest was rampant on a global scale (Rogers, 1932, pp.257-259). By the beginning of World War II every province in Canada offered Departmental Summer Schools whose electives were rural science, school gardening, household economics, manual training, art, music and literature (Johnson, 1968, p.20).

A powerful lever in increasing the quantity of inservice activities has been seen to be the establishment of government certification. An example of this leverage would be the establishment of British Columbia's "permanent teaching certificate" in 1937 which was granted according to each teacher's course credits. Furthermore, most inservice activities were still aimed toward teachers whose students were suffering from their

patchy pre-service training (Corey, 1957, p.2; Judd, 1940, p.383). The complexion of inservice changed permanently in the 1940's and 1950's in another way--at last both elementary and secondary teachers were being trained together toward professional status (Johnson, 1966, p.22). Less and less stigma of intellectual inferiority would be attached to the elementary teacher.

Inservice in the 1950's most often took the form of a workshop wherein teachers worked together with a resource person and a curriculum director. At the same time "action research" was undertaken by practitioners focusing on concrete problem situations, toward methodological resolution (Richey, 1957, pp.62-63). Amid a serious shortage of teachers, growing pressure toward high achievement in "fundamental" subjects, and racial integration struggles (Gumbert and Spring, 1974, pp.38-39) inservice grew manifold through workshops, conferences and inter-agency planning groups, i.e. university professors of physics, teachers and parents (Church, 1976, p.413; Cremin, 1961, p.337). Also, new requirements for the academic status of teachers ballooned inservice growth. For example, the B.Ed. became a minimum requirement according to N.E.A. resolution (Tyack, 1967, p.464). Consequently, inservice education became a central and promising endeavour of educators in the 1950's (Henry, 1957).

Yet, in the 1960's this promise was largely diminished, both through the degeneration of teacher and administration cooperation into a hierarchal manipulation of "clinical supervision", and through the rapid expansion of the curriculum field (Joyce, 1981, p.115). Inservice education may have waned from the flight from practical field concerns to large-scale

programming, disregard of evaluation with the emphasis on curriculum planning, ignorance of the teacher's role, and systematic management that glossed over underlying value assumptions (Connelly and Albaz, 1980). Large-scale programming of curriculum was paralleled by wide-ranging, generalized theorizing that cast teacher education programs as "models". Yet this drive failed to grasp teacher education in the field (Clarke, 1971, p.154).

From the mid 1970's to the present, long term curriculum change has been made more successful through increasing collaboration and dialogue among teachers, students and researchers through inservice (Wallace and Smith, 1978, pp.111-146). We presently see inservice teacher education becoming a vital concern for many other reasons: 1) Strong teachers' organizations demand professional development. 2) Existing tension between public alarm about falling student test scores and the consequent professional concern about a poor image. 3) Economic uncertainty that has increased the length of tenure of teachers with de-emphasizes preservice education in favour of an "on-the-job" focus of inservice. 4) In the face of economic stress, school-districts and larger governing bodies are becoming aware that municipal expenditures through inservice are substantially less than preservice costs at the provincial or state level. 5) The present acceleration of new knowledge in all fields that demands the cultivation of continuing education.

To reiterate, prior to the late 1800's in America, preservice and inservice education were not highly differentiated. By the 1890's, Teacher Institutes were formed to upgrade common school teachers in their proficiency

of subject-matter. Between 1890 and 1920, Normal school graduates were altering the quality and directions of the teacher Institutes by emphasizing methods and pedagogic principles. This thrust was followed by the "quantitative expansion" of inservice in the formation of Summer schools, evening extension courses, classroom supervision, class demonstrations, correspondence courses and teachers' reading circles. From the 1920's until the 1940's, experimentation and collegial guidance were the key motivators in inservice. Until very recently, the 1950's represented the high-point of interest in inservice teacher education as workshops and action research proliferated. In the 1960's inservice practises narrowed in scope as behavioural managerialism grew along with the presentation of pre-packaged materials. American educators of the mid 1970's until today have begun to realize the importance of inservice teacher education. This realization is deepened by socio-economic pressures and the failure of mechanical programming to evoke constructive educative change.

PART THREE

The Integration of Curriculum and Teacher Development (1890-1980)

In the late 1800's teaching theory and techniques had not yet been attached to subject specific curriculum methods, nor was student-teachers' practise teaching taking place with the awareness that the curriculum was evolving (Pangburn, 1932, pp. 70-72). Yet by 1913, the popular reference Cyclopedia of Education stated "one of the most significant agencies used for the training of teachers inservice is the making of the course of study" (Monroe, 1913, p. 519). Teachers were being enlisted to criticize and update the curriculum at their grade levels before local superintendents constituted change.

Certainly the impact of Dewey's philosophy had prepared the way for participation of teachers in curriculum revision. Dewey animated the concept of curriculum because he believed that if curriculum were simply viewed as a logical classification of principles and materials, then the immediacy and emotion of a child's practical life in class could too easily be ignored. To prevent this Dewey amended the concept of curriculum:

> "Now the value of the formulated wealth of knowledge that makes up the course of study is that it may enable the educator to determine the environment of the child, and thus by indirection to direct. Its primary value, its primary indication, is for the teacher, not for the child."
> (Dewey, 1902, p. 31)

Education's greatest modern philosopher clearly pointed to the daily reflection required by each teacher to enliven the curriculum in the lives of the students. In 1923, W.W. Charters added that changes in the curriculum are always preceded by modifications in our conception of the aim of education. As

he recognized that information has no value apart from its functional aim, he highlighted the role of the teacher in modifying the curriculum inservice (Charters, 1923, pp. 5-6). Hopkins further described individual teachers' interaction with the curriculum through their responsibility to evaluate student endeavours, their standardization and comparison of subjects, as well as their improvisation of methods and procedures (Hopkins, 1929, pp. vii-xiv).

Bobbitt goes on to describe the "curriculum discoverer" as an "analyst of human nature and human affairs" (Bobbitt, 1918, p. 43). He believed a curriculum couldn't be developed without first obtaining a broad overview of human affairs to assess planning. Then, and only then guidelines could be drawn up as specific statements of general educational and discipline-centered goals. Bobbitt too reminded educators, that in planning the curriculum first-hand classroom experience was fundamentally necessary to guide "high-grade living" in the present (Bobbitt, 1924, pp. 3-4).

Although from our present perspective we may view such a "personalization" or "individualization" of the curriculum as merely part of each teacher's job description, such efforts demanded special inservice development in the early 1900's. These special efforts might be exemplified in Morrison's mastery formula for teachers to guide their students' cognitive understanding, aesthetic appreciation and skill development. It consisted of seven steps: 1) identify "learning units" - which would include both the objective skill, fact or value being sought as well as the corresponding subjective transformation in the pupil which would result in a new attitude or special ability 2) pre-test to diagnose the student's present level in the learning unit. Morrison clearly perceived the possibility that a student might not require a particular lesson.

3) "teach" - including guidance towards study 4) test the result 5) adapt procedure 6) teach 7) test again to the point of actual learning (Morrison, 1926, Chapter 6). Morrison's "units of learning" then, whether they were meant to include a class, a group, or an individual, were composed of a variety of presentations, followed by supervision of study, testing of pupils for adaptations inherent in the unit, identification of student problems, and corrective teaching (Morrison, 1926, p. 153).

By 1918, the key document Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education held clear recommendations that each school have a "curriculum director" to coordinate school activities and that furthermore a "principal's council" be formed in each school. This council, consisting of teachers of various subjects, was projected as fertile beyond the scope of the separate subject disciplines. It would consist of a health director, citizenship director, subject directors, vocational education director, and a director of preparation for leisure (Kingsley, 1918, pp. 27-28). Such specialization was still considered in the context of a regular teaching role. Yet, unquestionably, a more clearly defined area of teachers' self-development was coming to life. In addition to "fitting" the curriculum to individual students' needs, "subject directors" were being called for to at once expand and reorganize both their own and school level curriculum knowledge.

It was not uncommon to view each school as the educational unit, responsible to develop its own curriculum based on situational needs and goals (Whitehead, 1932, p. 75-78). Before long, a flexible, well-planned curriculum was being considered more probable when constructed with the cooperation of pupils, teachers, curriculum specialists, subject-matter specialists, and

society in general. This wide base of cooperation would continually reconstruct and bring the curriculum up to date (Research Bulletin of the N.E.A., 1934, pp. 97-98).

The growing realization that the task of curriculum-making was difficult and complex enabled professional curriculum specialists to take their place in school districts (Rugg, 1927, pp. 147-148). In 1934, Henry Harap and numerous respected educators of the day met more than fifty times to "brainstorm" about composing curricula. Their general advice to any neophyte curriculum-making group was first to incorporate such a group with capable and industrious people. They came to the conclusion that such a curriculum-making group ought to be made-up of a superintendent and assistants to initiate, direct, judge and adapt the process; consulting experts, grounded in the subject-matter; teachers, for their awareness of actual classroom conditions, and their knowledge of available materials; a school-of-education representative, for further teacher-education; principals for administrative adjustment; and a bureau of publications for public adjustment and dissemination (Harap, 1935, pp. 241-243).

In a book chapter entitled The Hammers of Curriculum Revision, Krug (1972) informs us that many teachers of the 1930's and 40's were "hardened veterans of curriculum campaigns", brought in to the endeavour in part because of the current scientific management principle of involving employees in policy-making (Krug, 1972, p. 32). Between 1925 and 1940, curriculum revision came to be identified with inservice education; and at the same time as a kind of supervision. First existing as the strict observation of (elementary) teachers, supervision slowly took on a creative approach in curriculum planning with teachers (Newlon, 1929, p. 405). In some systems all teachers took part while

in others a select group accomplished the revision, with release time (Krug, 1972, p. 33).

In the same period inservice remediation of teachers' perceived weaknesses was still attempted. Typical areas of concern were teachers' home background, their culture, or their breadth of preservice preparation. For such "weaknesses" supervisors prescribed teacher institutes, reading circles or summer school remediation. For observed incompetence of teachers inservice, direct supervision was prescribed (Krug, 1972, p. 156).

However, while curriculum planning was being touted as the "new supervision" many administrators felt uneasy and threatened. A concrete display of this tendency was seen in 1929 when the same group who in 1928 had met under the collective name of "The National Conference on Educational Methods", just one year later called a meeting as "The National Conference of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction" (Krug, 1972, p. 163). In fact, superintendents reports were being used as evaluative references both for staffing and program funding (Love, 1978, p. 114). The highly centralized powers of supervisory staff to prescribe methods and courses tended to undercut the integration of curriculum and teacher development, because too often rigid uniformity denied teachers' the motivation to draft courses of study (Kandel, 1966, p. 38).

In other ways professional development increased with the more frequent publication of government circulars on education, as well as the proliferation of popular and professional magazines dealing with current educational issues; the coordination of teachers' research efforts by bureaus of education; and growth of teachers' professional associations such as the P.E.A. (Kandel, 1966, p. 37). For example, teachers were exhorted by George Counts (1932) in speeches

and pamphlets entitled Dare the School Build a New Social Order to not passively accept a vague and mediocre curriculum, but to at once nurture and impose upon their students their American culture.

Teachers' contributions to curriculum development continued to be called for by research in the 1940's. Curriculum scholars such as Alice Miel were reminding school district administrators to capitalize on minor complaints and dissatisfactions of local school personnel to secure their initial and continuing interest in the process of curriculum change. By regularizing opportunities for curriculum criticism, more constructive suggestions could then be arrived at. Goals ought to be flexible, both in long-term aims, and short-term objectives. Three distinct but simple curriculum study-groups were viable: teachers and other professionals, learners, and community adults. Experts could be invited to participate with the forknowledge that specialization has its own pitfalls, of narrow focus. Sharing techniques such as the division of labour, and keeping records was seen to contribute to continuity of development (Miel, 1946, pp. 189-192).

Tyler (1949, p. 37; 1975, p. 18; 1977, pp. 156-158) established a prime reference for curriculum makers in which he stressed the crucial role of the teacher. He also acknowledged that the intelligence each teacher brings to the task of curriculum development must draw upon their whole life experience. He describes this "practical enterprise" of revision as one that extends in scope the school to peer groups, the community and home. Tyler's contemporary, Vergil Herrick noted that any curriculum design depended on the competence of the teacher and his or her role in curriculum decision-making (Herrick, 1950, Chapter IV).

Another influential curriculum scholar of the 1940's-60's, Harold Alberty, underlined the pivotal role of teachers in curriculum development. In his much published Reorganizing the High School Curriculum, he names three leading principles of curriculum development: 1) that the individual school is the most satisfactory unit for curriculum development, 2) that curriculum development is primarily the responsibility of classroom teachers, and that 3) a sound supervisory program is directed toward helping teachers to become more competent in curriculum development (Alberty, 1953, pp. 522-525; Alberty, 1962, pp. 473-478). Running counter to the prevailing trend of the 60's, Alberty maintained from school experience that large scale "short-order" curriculum development by federal or foundation groups could never match the curriculum endeavours of commited local staff (Alberty, 1960, pp. 482-502; Alberty, 1953, pp. 540-545; Alberty, 1947, pp. 437-443).

Lee Cronbach also noted the growing dichotomy between theory and practice. He perceived this problem in terms of the heavy variations in the quality of texts by university educators, and the quality of the use of texts by classroom teachers. He agreed with Vergil Herrick's 1950 analysis of the varying levels of teacher responsibility in planning, which were seen to vacillate from great initiative to low, mechanical responsibility. He feared that many texts written at that time were not adequate for the level of responsibility of many classroom teachers (Cronbach, 1955, pp. 188-216).

In the 1960's there was increasing pressure to view teachers inservice from a deficit-of-skill perspective. For this reason, less direct input of classroom teachers' advice was sought as subject experts were more exclusively hired by districts and large textbook companies. However, John Goodlad looked forward to

a reform movement which would plan curriculum change "from the bottom up", with a knowledge of particular students and their achievements accounted for in the curriculum design and sequence (Goodlad, 1964, p. 59). He perceived a dangerous gap forming between subject-matter specialists and pedagogical concerns in the lower schools; as well as a growing disconcern for human aims and purposes in the '60's melee of behavioural objectives and systems analysis:

> "The lack of aims for education has virtually forced curriculum project groups to turn in upon their subjects for the determination of ends and means. As a consequence, ends and means frequently become hopelessly entwined: to learn the subject is the end; learning the subject is the means."
> (Goodlad, 1964, p. 81)

Goodlad was to remain adamant in his positive regard for classroom experimentation and on-going responsible contribution to the curriculum by the teaching community (Goodlad, 1966). He realized curriculum reform must reach three levels of decision-making: instructional - the teacher and student relationship; institutional - the administrators involved; and societal - government legislation (Goodlad and Richter, 1967, p. 7). He criticized the "black-box" coception of curriculum change, that is the unproblematic implementation of a drawing-board curriculum into the classroom.

Although the 1960's found Americans characteristically seeking effectiveness in programmatic curriculum change, the British sought to institutionalize quality inservice through teacher education (Henderson and Perry, 1981, p. 7). Thus, an Inservice B.Ed. became a fact soon after I.N.S.E.T. (Inservice Education and Training) began to emerge in Britain (Seaborne, 1981, p. 134). Also, teacher-centres arose throughout Britain, serving as resource centres, meeting-places and curriculum development combines. (Schools Council Publications, 1970, pp. 5-10).

That America has much to learn from Britain regarding inservice has been more recently described by teachers from both countries who participated in an exchange between British and American teacher-centres. Among other things, the British centres were understood as more diverse, more autonomous, and more oriented to making curriculum change (Edelfelt and Hruska, 1982, pp. 80-88). The British respect and concern for inservice education is also indicated by the establishment of The British Journal of Inservice Education, in 1976.

However, in America in 1970 Joseph Schwab powerfully demanded a renascence of practical curriculum development (Schwab, 1978, pp. 287-303; originally 1970). Schwab advocated that schools reach beyond the psychological determinism that behavioural psychology had provided (Schwab, 1958, pp. 169-184) toward collaboration and communication in a climate of teaching-learning-playing (Schwab, 1978B, pp. 8-11). Stenhouse, like Schwab, strongly voiced the concern that almost no research was aimed at illuminating practical situations of schooling to better inform teacher-education. He warned against a curriculum that encourages teaching devoted to catechism rather than discussion (Stenhouse, 1967, Chapter one). Addressing the central curricular concern of the 1970's, values in education, Stenhouse stated that values couldn't be taught effectively at high levels of generality, rather, that values express themselves in practical judgments. He supervised The Humanities Curriculum Project in which behavioural objectives were replaced by procedural guidelines to the teacher, along with available resource-material. (Stenhouse, 1970, pp. 103-117).

In 1975, Stenhouse stated that curriculum study is concerned with the relationship between curriculum as intention and curriculum as lived reality. This study he felt would not only result in a package of materials or syllabus of objectives but specifications about the practice of teaching. The responsibility for such curriculum research and development, Stenhouse believed ought to belong to the teacher. He acknowledged that for this to take place generally, the teacher's professional self-image and conditions of work would have to change. He pictured each class as a laboratory, each teacher a member of a scientific community. Stenhouse concludes that schools must begin to see themselves as research and development institutions, rather than research and development agencies (Stenhouse, 1975, Chapter one, ten and fourteen). At heart, Stenhouse's view of curriculum asks the student to learn as the teacher learns, rather than attempt to know what the teacher knows (Stenhouse, 1980, pp. 244-262).

By 1977, Cronbach, working with Richard Snow, had made a careful compilation of research into curricular practices that was very comprehensive in its scope. Varying from studies of "fluid ability" (creativity) to the effects of teacher and student belief-systems on learning, their over-arching collection and critique of research is a valuable reference to curricular problems focusing on valued change (Cronbach and Snow, 1977, p. 153; pp. 478-480).

The shift in the emphasis of research in the 1970's can be regarded in a number of ways. It could be seen as a change from naive, logistic development, to a recognition of the problematic quality of any school change. Whether from the vantage point of professional development or from curriculum implementation

programming, the move from the drawing board to actual school experience could no longer be regarded as unproblematic (Fullan, 1977, p. 337).

Further, the growing curriculum focus on action and values-in-action has served to intensify interest in, and respect for, the teacher's place in curriculum change. The teacher's skills of deliberation, and his or her capacity to adapt and define materials has proven crucial to curriculum innovation. As teacher's inservice capabilities have been engaged, school adaptation of curriculum aims and designs has improved, discrediting the "remote-control" implementation of "teacher-proof" programs (Bruner, 1961, p. 15; Huebner, 1966, p. 109; Fenstermacher, 1967, pp. 78-82; Torgunrud, E. A., 1974, pp. VII-VIII; Lortie, 1975, pp. 111-115; Stenhouse, 1975, p. 31, 142; Olson, 1977, p. 61-65; Good and Brophy, 1978, Chapter 5; House and Lapan, 1978, p. 186; Clark and Yinger, 1979, pp. 175-179).

Then again, current changes in the research on inservice teacher education may result in part from the increasing recognition that we cannot automatically rely on personal professional upgrading on the part of individual teachers to make coordinated programmatic efforts that benefit the wider society (Howey, 1976, p. 25). Teacher inservice that has focused on the individual has had little impact on change in the schools and on those teachers' peers (Corwin and Edelfelt, 1977, p. viii). On the other hand, monocular research emphasizing large-scale, de-personalized program change has also failed (Weiss, 1978; Stake and Easley, 1978; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978).

The importance of coordinating institutional needs and resources with those of the individual in inservice activities cannot be overstated (Howey,

1976; Corwin and Edelfelt, 1977; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978). Michael Fullan has also cited the vital, formative quality of curriculum development and implementation (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977, text; Fullan, 1978, p. 140; Fullan, 1982, text) defining a change in practice as having taken place when organizational, material, behavioural, knowledge and value changes have been realized together.

"Facts and values come in integrated conceptual packages" (Strike, 1979, p. 14). The curriculum problematic is a unique, changing context, composed of complexes of conflicting aims to be balanced, decisions to be reached, reasoned arguments, unposed question, ambiguities and unpredictable outcomes (Reid, 1978, p. 46). Both curriculum development activities and inservice teacher education are multi-dimensional, alinear, dynamic and continuous, and meet in the pivotal role of the teachers (Russell, 1975, pp. 27-31).

The process of curriculum change naturally dove-tails into inservice teacher education as teachers begin **making** rather than **taking** curriculum. That is, increasingly, teachers are becoming involved in planning, implementing and evaluation of curriculum, enabling their educative self-renewal through reflection on the meaning of the experience (Gough, 1977, p. 218).

Synopsis: Integration of Curriculum and Teacher Development (see Appendix II)

In the late 1800's curriculum was regarded as an unchanging quantity of classical knowledge. However, around the turn of this century, curriculum development was recognized as a valuable method of educating teachers inservice. Such activities were generally not only school but class-specific, rather than district-wide endeavours.

By 1918 teachers were seen as curriculum specialists in their own right, capable of translating and updating curriculum knowledge for their students. In the 1920's and 1930's teachers inservice were regarded as part of a broadly based curriculum development group that also included students, principals, curriculum specialists, subject-matter experts and the local community. In the 1930's, particular recognition was given to teachers' contact with students and daily awareness of available materials in development activities.

By 1940, curriculum revision became fully identified as an aspect of inservice teacher education. Administrators tended to view it as an aspect of supervision. This identification of curriculum revision with supervision tended to undercut teachers' professional inservice development. Nevertheless, the strong proliferation of education publications and professional teacher organizations offset administrative constraints at this time.

The importance of research supporting the teacher's role in curriculum development that proliferated from the 1930's to the 1960's has been vital to integration. The mechanistic, large-scale initiatives to develop curriculum in the 1960's were regarded as largely unsuccessful. In contrast, the return of the teacher to a central role in curriculum development through the 1970's emphasis on values has provided us with fertile ground for change in the

1980's. Such development is increasingly recognized as critical at both the individual and organizational levels of teacher and curriculum development.

PART FOUR

Back to the Future: Implications of Current Research and Practice on the Evolution of Curriculum and Teacher Development

Upon reviewing the chronology of curriculum and inservice teacher development up to the 1980's, a few points stand out.

1. Inservice practises although various, have tended to evolve cumulatively. That is, Institutes still exist alongside summer schools, workshops, and teacher centers. On the other hand, curriculum orientations have been more exclusive in their evolution. However, the 1960's is clearly the era in which both teacher and curriculum development singly struggled with internal conflicts and narrowing of the teacher's role.
2. The curriculum researchers' powerful concern with values throughout the 1970's re-established the role of the teacher in curriculum-making. This work undoubtedly encouraged inservice teacher education advancement in teacher centers as well as stimulating further research in inservice itself.
3. There have been eight different kinds of inservice teacher education activities (Appendix III).
4. Educational progress is now regarded as optimum when the personal aims of staff and the organizational goals of schools merge. Therefore, the integration of curriculum and teacher development should indeed support educational progress into the next century.

This chapter will presently consider three aspects of such integration:

1) What integration now means in teacher and curriculum development;

2) How current forces in education may impact upon integration;

3) Concrete methods of integration for the future.

1. What is integration in the 1980's?

The backdrop to any curriculum and teacher development seems relatively consistent: economic uncertainty and stress, heavy classroom responsibilities of teachers, the complex nature of teaching, the isolation of the teacher's work world, and steady requirements for updating knowledge and methods.

Three major reasons for teachers' participation in developing curriculum have been recently described as 1) teacher's low status 2) their isolation from other teachers 3) lack of other avenues of esteem (Young, 1985, pp. 387-414). Also, adult learning theory proposes that teachers' participation in the design, conduct and evaluation of their own learning is central to their professional development (Apps, 1981).

Stenhouse (1980, p. 80) informs us that curriculum development is equivalent to teacher self-development. He explains that a growing body of classroom teachers regard curriculum change as refinement of their own practise rather than simply altering content and method. This perspective appears to be reinforced by current findings in curriculum implementation research which discovered four common components of successful implementation: 1) adaptive planning - a good match between the needs of the project and the participants 2) locally-keyed staff development 3) local materials development and 4) critical mass - the sense of community purpose and morale among participants (Tumposky, 1987).

In looking at curriculum change as an aspect of teachers' practical refinement, three general "stages" of teacher maturity might well be accounted for: their first year or two of a class survival stage; then their gaining competence in an adjustment stage and the experienced stage of methodological experimentation (Peterson, 1960, p. 229; Fuller, 1969; Fuller and Brown, 1975; Glickman, 1980; Burden, 1983). Discrepancies in individual teachers' personal needs and abilities serve as a caution against rigidly generalizing about teachers' developmental stages (Feiman and Floden, 1981; Mertens and Yarger, 1982).

Regarding what has actually been taking place in the recent integration of teacher and curriculum development, Neil (1986) outlines a number of contributing approaches: teacher and administrator collaboration; diverse teacher center proliferation; special study of induction year activities. There can be little doubtof the value of participation and collaboration amongst variouslevels of staff during inservice activity(Berman and Friedewitzer, 1981; Urick, 1981). Many kinds of participation have proven valuable, such as the enactment of teaching skills by demonstration, practice with peers in simulated and actual conditions, structured small-group feedback in video and dialogue, and mutual planning toward actual school applications (Wood and Thompson, 1982; Schwartz, 1984).

David Hopkins continues Stenhouse's drive for research by teachers in their classrooms. His book A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research (1985) advocates experimentation to improve the quality of educational life in the classroom. The focus of such classroom research is often curriculum change, accomplished by teachers who have "autonomous professional judgment". Such understanding is one

common condition of curriculum change (Fullan, 1985, p. 200), and helps teachers improve their professional status (Case et al, 1986; Beattie, 1986). Fullan (1980, p. 9) has stated that curriculum implementation is becoming the preoccupation of inservice in Canada. When engaged in the inservice/curriculum development process, four consecutive activities of teachers have been described as: 1) analysing current practise; 2) applying theory critically to one's practice, 3) developing curriculum, 4) working with a team of teachers to improve the curriculum as practiced (Ashton, 1982, pp. 18-21).

British classroom teachers involved in teacher training and curriculum dissemination are thus qualifying for M.Ed.'s and Diploma credits (Marsh, 1986, p. 184). U.S. teachers are paying for workshops given by top-name educators. These workshops include assignment of papers and curriculum projects for university credit (Henderson, 1986, p. 385). Such partnerships between school districts and the wider community have been initiated both at the school district level (Buski and Small, 1982, pp. 39-41) and at the university level (Worth in Stewart, 1979; Oberg, 1985).

We are warned that curriculum development can be an "empty exercise" for teachers unless we make provision for small groups of process-oriented teachers who are unafraid to learn from their own mistakes within a "community of learners" (Westcott Dodd, 1986, p. 380). Successful tactics include release-time for teachers and inter-school visits of consultants and teachers themselves. Neil (1985) observed that over-simplification of the process and weak evaluation often contribute to inservice failure. Long-term curriculum change is unlikely if a coherent system of staff development is not in place (Wood et al, 1981, p. 64-86). Such a system includes five moments: 1) inviting

teacher readiness 2) planning activities based on needs, interests resources 3) training through orientation and learning teams 4) implementation with follow-up assistance, administrative support and evaluation 5) maintenance through (self)monitoring.

Corrigan and Howey (1980) add that "It is imperative that new directions in teacher education be embedded in and consonant with equally innovative directions in school renewal. Major reform in one cannot occur without concurrent major reform in the other" (p. 198). They remind us that inservice education and curriculum development must progress alongside other schooling reforms such as deeper parent involvement, reduction of class size, an individual school-planning emphasis, an emphasis on academic freedom through responsible choice by students and teachers, flexible timing, stronger community links, and an on-going re-examination of teacher roles (Corrigan and Howey, 1980, pp. 200-205).

2. Current forces in education and their possible impact on curriculum and teacher development

Two major forces in today's educational arena will certainly impact on curriculum and teacher development: (i) the tug-of-war between the perspective of teacher development versus that of teacher deficits and (ii) career ladders (of the teacher reform movement).

(i) Teacher development versus teacher deficits. A glance at teacher education literature (Wittrock, 1986) informs us of the current concerns with the efficiency of teaching. However overemphasis of efficiency in subject knowledge can lead to the conception of instruction and teaching as mere sub-sets of

curriculum (Broudy and Smith, 1964, p. 78). Curriculum development has received more prestige than inservice - which has been regarded as simply reinforcing the results of successful curriculum development (Schools Council Publications, 1970, p. 22). In fact, curriculum has even been viewed as the sum-total of educative experiences rather than progress in a specified body of organized subject matter (Saylor, 1941, p. 1; Caswell and Campbell, 1935, Chapter IV).

Kliebard succinctly addressed the problem of establishing a constructive definition of curriculum during the advent of the curricular values - implosion of the 1970's:

> I think that the basic problem we face as a field as we move into our second half-century is one of self-identification... One of the ways I think we can face this is by critically examining our heritage as a field of study...Should we continue to define the field of curriculum so that, in effect, it includes teaching? Or does this tend to obfuscate an important etymological and conceptual distinction?
>
> (Kliebard, 1968, 83-84)

Kliebard regarded the fact that other educators tend to include almost anything educational under the rubric "curriculum" as a sign of immaturity of the field.

Holly and Blackman (1983) point out that two main currents of thought infuse school improvement efforts: 1) a developmental model, revealed in the drift towards continuing teacher education which supports ongoing professional development and 2) a deficit model revealed in efforts to evaluate teachers' ethical and academic competency. These two currents may very well stem from the two traditions of teacher education itself: 1) the professional tradition that nurtures general education as well as educational principles of learning and 2) the academic tradition of subject specialization (Cushman, 1977, p. 36).

Clearly, for curriculum and teacher development to remain integrated, a careful balance of professional and academic traditions will need to be kept. In keeping with this sense of balance, the answer to Kliebard's question would be "No, curriculum should not be defined so that it includes teaching--rather curriculum studies should be more carefully identified with the academic tradition of subject specialization". Perhaps curricularists fear this because of the curriculum field's fairly consistent stress on inquiry and discovery rather than instruction as a basis for learning (Stenhouse, 1980, p.249). It is true however that staff development cannot alone be adequately related to the act of teaching because much student learning occurs during the "work" portion of a class (Anderson, 1987, pp.64-65).

But curriculum should be identified with teacher inservice education because implementation often fails when those providing staff developoment, at the behest of curriculum policy-makers, see it primarily as a technical service, rather than as a learning experience for all the participants. What seems rational from the curriculum developers point of view is not necessarily so from the teacher's point of view, particularly if the two teacher role perceptions are incongruent (Tumposky, 1987). Successful programs of inservice have been found to underscore a development rather than a deficit model. Teachers are regarded in an active role; there is whole-staff involvement and locally-oriented curriculum is made (Lawrence, 1981).

There are three major outcomes of staff development: 1) change in classroom practices; 2) change in teachers beliefs and attitudes; 3) change in learning outcomes of students (Guskey, 1986, p.6). A <u>development</u> model relates to all three, while a <u>deficit</u> model is directly involved only with

one outcome--the learning of students (due to teachers' faults). Nevertheless, Pratt (1987) points out that curriculum development must transcend one-sided humanistic and technical orientations because the culture of the classroom is neither--it is traditional. It is the purpose of integrated development to contribute to a tradition that will enable teachers to improve teaching, enable students to better learn, and improve and renew curriculum materials.

(ii) Career ladders, and the teacher reform movement. Teacher education is receiving the lion's share of contemporary attention being given to reform in education. Prominent educators and policy makers have recently published Tomorrow's Teachers, The Holmes Report, The Carnegie Report, A Nation at Risk, and The National Governor's Report on Education Reform.

These reform reports have been criticized for linking students and teachers too narrowly with regard to their mediocre effectiveness (Shor, 1986). The reports' rhetoric of new federalism has been viewed as a disguise which seeks to centralize and standardize educational changes, but inhibits culture (Popekewitz et al, 1986). Carlson (1985) claims the reformist view of teacher accountability according to students' performance ignores teachers abilities and interests in curriculum making. Also, these reports are criticized for carrying a perspective which denies real political and social factors (Darling-Hammond, 1987).

Still, a highlight of the Holmes Report and the National Governor's Report is the concept of differentiation of teaching roles among professionals in schools, so that in effect, a new career-ladder would come into existence (Alexander, 1987, p.3; Joyce, 1987, p.391; Howey and Zimpher, 1986, p.44). Further, the establishment of separate graduate schools for teacher development

is being considered to accomodate this drive to further differentiation of competence, function and performance amongst teaching professionals. Termed "clinical schools", "institutions of pedagogy" or "professional development schools" (Ducharme, 1986, p.53; Gore, 1987, p.4) there is some fear that such establishments might encourage a caste system of teacher-aides, restricted professionals, extended professionals and master teachers (Prakash, 1986, p.226).

At the same time, there are precedents to the idea of multiple roles within the teaching profession (Stenhouse, 1975, p.143) and the importance of enhancing continuing education as an aspect of teacher professionalism (Edelfelt, 1981). Certainly the idea of attaching Professional Development Schools in long-lasting partnerships with nearby grade-schools (Petrie, 1985, p.246) would improve both curriculum and teacher development. But it may be true that as the need for new teachers grows over the next decade, the enhancement and extension of professional career ladders will compete with funding for undergraduate access (Howey and Zimpher, 1986, p.44).

3. Conclusion: Concrete Methods of Integration for the Future

Teachers talk with one another for about forty minutes a day--frequently discussing materials, discipline, weekly activities and individual students. Far less discussion is aimed at methods, evaluation, presentation techniques and organization of the learning environment (Zahorik, 1987, pp.385-396). It is these areas that special curriculum and inservice development can complement. Six traditional methods seem well-suited to such development: reading circles, collegial supervision practises, classroom demonstrations and observations, workshops, action research, and teacher centers could all be powerful methods

of curriculum/teacher development. Formal accreditation for such endeavours could only serve to further professionalize teaching.

REFERENCES

Alberty, Harold (1947). Reorganizing the high school curriculum. New York: MacMillan.

Alexander, Lamar (1987). National Governors' Association Report on Education Reform. Education Digest, April, pp.2-5.

Anderson, Lorin W. (1987). Staff development and instructional improvement Educational Leadership. February, pp.64-65.

Apps, J.W. (1981). The adult learner on campus: a guide for instructors and administrators. Chicago: Follett.

Ashton, Patricia et al (1982). An account of the D.E.S. open-university report. British Journal of Inservice Education. Autumn, pp.18-21.

Axtelle, George E. et al (1940). Teachers for democracy. Yearbook IV of the John Dewey Society. New York: D. Appleton - Century Co.

Bailyn, B. (1982). The challenge of modern historiography. American Historical Review. Vol. 87, (2).

Beattie, Catherine (1986). The case for teacher directed curriculum evaluation. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing. Vol. 6, (4), pp.56-73.

Berman, Barbara and Friedewitzer, Fredda (1981). A pragmatic approach to inservice education. Action in Teacher Education. Vol. 3, (1), pp.51-57.

Berman, Paul and McLaughlin, Milbrey W. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change volume VIII: implementing and sustaining innovations. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, contract HEW05 - 73-216. The Rand Corporation.

Bobbitt, Franklin (1918). The curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Bobbitt, Franklin (1924). How to make a curriculum. Cambridge: Riverside Press.

Bode, Boyd (1939). Democracy as a way of life. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Brickman, William W. (1982). Educational historiography: tradition, theory, and technique. Cherry Hill, New Jersey: Emeritus, Inc.

Broudy, Harry S., Smith, B. Othanel, Burnett, Joe R. (1964). Democracy and excellence in American secondary education. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Bruner, Jerome S. (1961). The process of education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burden, Paul R. (1983). Implications of teacher career development: new roles for teachers, administrators, and professors. Action in Teacher Education. Volume IV (4), pp. 21-25.

Buski, J.S. and Small, J.M. (1982). Needs and opinion survey. The A.T.A. Magazine. pp. 39-41.

Carlson, Dennis (1985). Curriculum and the school work culture. Excellence in Education. (Eds.) Gail P. Kelly and Lois Weis, Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books.

Case, Charles W. and Judith Lanier, Cecil Miskel (1986). The Holmes group report: impetus for gaining professional status for teachers, Journal of Teacher Education. July/August; pp.36-42.

Caswell, Hollis L. and Campbell, Doak S. (1935). Curriculum development New York: American Book Co.

Charters, W.W. (1923). Curriculum construction. New York: MacMillan Co.

Church, Robert L. (1976). Education in the United States. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Clark, Christopher; Yinger, Bob (1979). Research on teacher planning, Journal of Curriculum Studies. Vol. 11 (2), pp. 175-179.

Clarke, S.C.T. (1971). Designs for programs of teacher education in B.O. Smith (Editor). Research in Teacher Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Connelly, Michael F., and Albaz, Freema (1980). Conceptual bases for curriculum thought: a teacher's perspective. ASCD Yearbook: Considered action for curriculum improvement. Washington, ASCD.

Corey, Stephen M. (1957). Introduction in Nelson B. Henry (Editor). Inservice education: the fifty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Corrigan, Dean C. and Howey, Kenneth R. (1980). The future: creating the conditions for professional practice. Concepts to Guide the Education of Teachers. Virginia: The ERIC Clearinghouse.

Corwin, Ronald G. and Edelfelt, Roy A. (1977). Perspectives on organization. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Cremin, Lawrence (1961). The transformation of the school. New York: Alfred Knopf Publishers.

Cremin, Lawrence (1964). The transformation of the school. New York: Vintage Books.

Cremin, Lawrence A. (1965). The wonderful world of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley. New York: Teacher's college Publications.

Cronbach, Lee J. (1955). Text materials in modern education. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Cronbach, Lee J. and Snow, Richard E. (1977). Aptitudes and instructional methods. New York: Irvington, Publishers Inc.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. (1920). The history of education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co.

Cushman, M.L. (1977). The governance of teacher education. Phi Delta Kappa, Berkley: McCutchan Pub. Co.

Darling-Hammond L. (1984). Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Dewey, John. The child and the curriculum. (1902). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Duke, Edward R. (1986). The professors and the reports: time to act, in The Journal of Teacher Education. Sept./Oct., pp.51-55.

Elliott, Roy A. (1981). Six years of progress in inservice education. Journal of Research and Development in Education. Volume 14, (2), pp.112-119.

Elliott, Roy and Hruska, Marrita (1981). British American exchange in teacher centers. British Journal of Inservice Education. Volume 9, (2), pp.80-88.

Feiman, Sharon, Floden, Robert E. (1981). A critique of developmental approaches to teacher education. Action in Teacher Education. Volume 3, (1).

Gage, Nathacher, Gary D. (1967). Need-achievement theory and educational practice: a transformation. Philosophy of Education, 1967. Proceedings of the 23rd annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, (Ed.) D.B. Gowin, pp.76-83.

Fullan, Michael (1978). Implementing change in occupational education. Ithaca: Cornell Institute for Occupational Education.

Fullan, Michael (1985). Integrating theory and practice. (Ed.) David Hopkins and Ken Reid Re-thinking Teacher Education. London: Croom-Helm.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fullan, Michael, Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on curriculum and Instruction. Review of Educational Research. Vol. 47, (2).

Fuller, Frances (1969). Concerns of teachers: a developmental characterization. AERA Journal. Volume 6, (2), pp.207-226.

Fuller, F.F. and Brown, O.H. (1975). Becoming a teacher in K. Ryan (Editor). The seventy-fourth yearbook of the National society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gaffield, Chad (1986). Coherence and chaos in educational historiography. Interchange. Volume 17, (2), pp.112-121.

Glickman, Carl D. (1980). The developmental approach to supervision. Educational Leadership. Volume 38, (2), pp.178-180.

Good, Thomas, Brophy, Jere (1978). Looking in classrooms. New York: Harper and Row Co.

Goodlad, John I. (1964). School curriculum reform in the United States. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Goodlad, John I., Richter, Maurice N. Jr. (1967). The development of a conceptual system for dealing with problems of curriculum and instruction. Los Angeles: Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, University of California.

Goodlad, John I., Stoephasius, Renata von; Klein, M. Frances (1966). The changing school curriculum. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Gore, Joseph (1987). Liberal and professional education, Journal of Teacher Education. January/February, pp.2-5.

Gough, Robert G. (1977). Curriculum development and teacher education. British Journal of Inservice Education. Vol. 3, (3).

Gumbert, Edgar B. and Spring, Joel H. (1974). The superschool and the superstate: American education in the twentieth century, 1918 - 1970. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Guskey, Thomas R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational Researcher. May, pp.5-12.

Harap, Henry (1935). The technique of curriculum making. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Harris, Robin S. (1976). A history of higher education in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Henderson, Euan S. and Perry, George W. (1981). Change and development in schools. London: McGraw-Hill.

Henderson, Howard (1986). The Madison workshops. Phi Delta Kappan. January, pp.384-385.

Henry, Nelson B. (1957). Inservice education; the fifty-sixth yearbook of the NSSE, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Herrick, Virgil E., Tyler, Ralph, W. (Eds.) (1950). Toward improved curriculum theory. The School Review. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Number 71.

Holly, Mary Louise and Blackman, Charles (1983). Building a conceptual framework for professional development. Action in Teacher Education. Vol. 3, (1), pp.1-10.

Hopkins, David (1985). A teacher's guide to classroom research. Philadelphia: Open Unversity Press.

Hopkins, David and Ken Reid (1985). Rethinking teacher education. London: Croom Helm.

Hopkins, L. Thomas (1929). Curriculum principles and practices. New York: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Co.

House, E., Lapan, S. (1973). Survival in the classroom. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Howey, Kenneth R. (1976). Organization for inservice teacher education in Bruce Joyce (Editor). Issues in Inservice Education. Syracuse, Syracuse University Press.

Howey, Kenneth R. (1986). Six major functions of staff development: an expanded imperative. Journal of Teacher Education. January/February, pp.58-63.

Howey, Kenneth R. and nancy L. Zimpher (1986). The current debate on teacher preparation, Journal of Teacher Education. September/October, pp.41-49.

Huebner, Dwayne (1966). Curriculum as a field of study. (Ed.) Helen F. Robison, Precedents and Promise in the Curriculum Field, Columbia University; Teacher's College Press.

Johnson, F. Henry (1967). Teacher education in historical perspective. Vancouver: U.B.C. Press.

Johnson, F. Henry (1968). A brief history of Canadian education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Co.

Joyce, Bruce R. (1981). A memorandum for the future in Betty Dillon-Peterson (Editor). Staff development/organization development. Washington, D.C., ASCD.

Joyce, Bruce (1987). Reflections on 'Tomorrow's Teachers'. Teacher's College Record. Volume 88, (3).

Joyce, Bruce and Weil, Marsha (1972). Models of teaching. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Judd, Charles H. and John Dale Russell (1940). The american educational system. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co.

Kandel, I.L. (1966). Twenty-five years of American education, (2nd edition). New York: Books for Libraries Press.

Kingsley, Clarence (1918). Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, Bulletin #35. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Kliebard, H. (1968). The curriculum field in retrospect. (Ed.) P.W. Witt, Technology and the Curriculum. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Krug, Edward A. (1972). The shaping of the American high school, volume two. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin Press.

Lawrence, Gordon (1981). A synthesis of research on the effectiveness of staff development programs. Paper presented at the State of Ohio Department of Education Annual Conference on Inservice Education. Columbus, Ohio, May 5.

Lazerte, M.E. (1951). Teacher education in Canada. Toronto: W.J. Gage Publishers.

Lortie, Dan C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: Unversity of Chicago Press.

Love, James (1978). The professionalization of teachers in the mid-nineteenth century Upper Canada. Egerton Ryerson and his times. Neil Macdonald and Alf Chaiton (Editors), Toronto: MacMillan.

Macdonald, James B. (1974). A transcendental developmental ideology of education. (Ed.) William Pinar, Heightened Consciousness, Cultural Revolution and Curriculum Theory, Berkley, California:. McCutchan Publishers.

Marsh, Colin (1986). IT-INSET: dissemination strategies and tactics. British Journal of Educational Studies. Vol. 34 (2), pp.182-196.

Mertens, S. and Yarger, S. (1982). Escape from deja-vu: on strengthening teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education. Volume 33 (4), pp.8-12.

Miel, Alice (1946). Changing the curriculum: a social process. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts Inc.

Monroe, Paul (1913). Editor. A cyclopedia of education. New York: The MacMillan Company; pp.515-523.

Morrison, Henry C. (1926). The practice of teaching in th secondary school. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Neil, Roger (1985). Inservice teacher education: five common causes of failure, Action in Teacher Education; Vol. 8 (3), pp.49-55.

Neil, Roger (1986). Current models and approaches to inservice teacher education, British Journal of Inservice Teacher Education. Fall, pp.58-67.

Newlon, Jesse (1929). Teacher participation in curriculum construction, Journal of Educational Method, Vol. 8, April, p.405.

Oberg, Antoinette (1985). curriculum study and professional practice: how are they linked? Journal of Curriculum Studies. Vol. 17 (2), pp.125-127.

Olson, John K. (1977). Teacher education and curriculum change: re-examining the relationship. Curriculum Inquiry, Vol. 7 (1), pp.61-65.

Pangburn, Jessie M. (1932). The evolution of the American teachers college. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications.

Patterson, Robert (1976). History of teacher education in Alberta in Lampard, Dorothy (Editor) Teacher education in Alberta. Lethbridge: University of Lethbridge Press.

Peterson, A.D.C. (1960). A hundred years of education. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd.

Petrie, Hugh G. (1985). Educational reform and teacher education; Philip G. Altbach (Ed.) Excellence in Education. New York: Prometheus Books.

Popkewitz, Thomas S., and Allan Pitman, Arlene Barry (1986). Educational reform and its millenial quality: the 1980s. Journal of Curriculum Studies. Vol. 18 (3), pp.267-283.

Prakash, Madhu Suri (1986). Reforming the teaching of teachers: trends, contradictions and challenges, Teachers College Record, Volume 88 (2), pp.217-240.

Pratt, David (1987). Curriculum design as humanistic technology. The Journal of Curriculum Studies. Vol. 19 (2), pp.149-162.

Richey, Herman G. (1957). Growth of the modern conception of inservice education in Nelson B. Henry (Editor). Inservice education: the fifty-sixth yearbook of the NSSE, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rogers, Lester B. (1932). The place of schools of education in the program of improvement of university instruction, School and Society, Volume 36, (922), pp.257-264.

Rugg, Harold (1927). The foundation of curriculum making: 26th yearbook of the N.S.S.E., Part II. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co.

Russell, Earl B. (1975). Upgrading curricula through change-oriented teachers. Theory to Practice. Volume 14, Fall, pp.27-31.

Saylor, Galen J. (1941). Factors associated with participation in cooperative programs of curriculum development. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia University.

Schaefer, Robert J. (1944). The School as a centre of inquiry. New York: Harper and Row.

Schiro, M. (1978). Curriculum for better schools: the great ideological debate. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Public.

Schubert, William (1980). Curriculum books, the first 80 years. Landam, M.D.: University Press.

Schwab, Joseph (1958). On the corruption of education by psychology. The School Review, Vol. 67, Summer, pp.169-184.

Schwab, Joseph J. (1978). Goals of schooling. Educational Technology, Vol. 18, (5).

Schwab, Joseph J. (1978). The practical, a language for curriculum. (Editor) Ian Westbury and Neil J. Wilkof, Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schwartz, Judith (1984). Teacher directed In-Service: a model that works. Teacher's College Record. Vol. 86 (1), pp.223-237.

Schools Council (1970). Teacher's centres and the changing curriculum, pamphlet #6. London: Schools's Council Publications.

Seaborne, Peter L. (1981). Inservice bachelor of education in Henderson and Perry (Editors), Change and development in schools. London: McGraw-Hill.

Shor, Ira (1986). Equality is excellence: transforming teacher education and the learning process. Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 56 (4), pp.406-426.

Stake, Robert E. and Easley, Jack A. (1978). Case studies in science education. Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois.

Stenhouse, Lawrence (1967). Culture and education. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Stenhouse, Lawrence (1970). Controversial value-issues in the classroom. (Ed.) William C. Carr, Values and the Curriculum, a Report of the 4th International Curriculum Conference. Washington, D.C.: N.E.A.

Stenhouse, Lawrence (1975). An introduction to curriculum research and development. London: Heinemann.

Stenhouse, Lawrence (1980). Curriculum research and development in action. London: Heinemann.

Strike, Kenneth A. (1979). An epistemology of practical research. Educational Researcher, Vol. 8 (11), pp.10-16.

Taba, Hilda (1945). General techniques of curriculum planning. (Ed.) Ralph Tyler, American Education in the Postwar Period: 44th Yearbook of the N.S.S.E.; Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, William (1978). Research and reform in teacher education: Council of Europe. Berkshire: NFER Pub. Co.

Torgunrud, E.A. Foreward in (Ed.) J. Blaney, I. Housego, and G. Macintosh (1974). Program Development in Education. Vancouver, B.C.: Education Extension Center for Continuing Education, The University of British Columbia.

Tyler, Ralph W. (1975). Specific approaches to curriculum development. (Ed.) Jon Schaffarzick and David H. Hampson, Strategies for Curriculum Development. Berkley, California: McCutchan Publishing.

Tyler, Ralph W. (1977). Desirable content for a curriculum development syllabus today. (Ed.) Alex Molnar and John A. Zahorik, Curriculum Theory. Washington, D.C.: A.S.C.D.

Tumposky, Nancy Rennau (1987). Staff development and curriculum implementation. The Educational Forum. Vol. 51 (2).

Tyack, David B. (1967). American educational history. Massachussets: Blaisdell Pub.

Tyack, D.B. (1967). Turning points in American educational history. Waltham, Massachussetts: Blaisdell Publishers.

Urick, Ronald V. (1981). Pre-conditions for staff development. Educational Leadership. Vol. 38 (7), pp.546-549.

Walker, Decker (1971). A naturalistic model for curriculum development. The School Review, Vol. 80 (1), November, pp.51-65.

Wallace, David K., and Smith, E. Brooks (1978). Models of multidimensional curriculum development and inservice education in Roy A. Edelfelt and E. Brooks Smith (Editors). Breakaway to multidimensional approaches. Washington: Association of Teacher Educators.

Weiss, Iris R. (1978). Report of the 1977 national survey of science, mathematics and social studies education. North Carolina: Center for Educational Research and Evaluation.

Westcott Dodd, Anne and Eileen Rosenbaum (1986). Learning communities for curriculum and staff development. Phi Delta Kappan, January, pp.380-385.

Whitehead, Alfred North (1932). The aims of education. London: Norgate and Williams Lts.

Wood, Fred H. and Thompson, S.R. (1982). Discussion about staff development. Educational Leadership. Vol. 55, pp.250-252.

Wood, Fred H. and Steven R. Thompson, Sister Frances Russell (1981). Designing effective staff development programs. Betty Dillon-Peterson (Ed.) Staff Development/Organization Development. Alexandria: A.S.C.D.

Young, Jean Helen (1985). Participation in curriculum development: an inquiry in to the responses of teachers. Curriculum Inquiry. Vol. 15 (4), pp.387-414.

Zahorik, John A. (1987). Teachers' Collegial interaction: an exploratory study. The Elementary School Journal. Vol. 87 (4), pp.385-396.

Appendix I

Major Changes in the Meaning of Curriculum:

An Historical Overview

Among curriculum writers there has been wide agreement that education is a dynamic process, with three fundamental sources: the student, the subject-matter, and society (Dewey, 1902, pp. 4, 11, 12; Rugg, 1927, pp. 19-20; Bode, 1939, p. 82; Taba, 1945, p. 83; Herrick, 1950, p. 113, Cremin, 1964, Chapter IV; Joyce and Weil, 1972, Schiro, 1978, p. 313; Schubert, 1980, pp. 15-24).

But within this broad consensus as to the sources of educational processes there has yet been considerable change in the shades and depths of meaning given to the term curriculum during the 20th century. These changes will be regarded within five time frames.

1. The 1890's to 1920.

Curriculum gradually became distinguished from education itself in the mid 1800's as the appearance of universal schooling necessitated a commensurate expansion of the subjects to be taught and the materials to be used in teaching.

Then, in 1893, Harvard President Charles W. Eliot intensified the educational focus on curriculum by establishing the Committee of Ten. This committee, and the Committee of Fifteen (1895) concerned themselves with course

...../2

requirements, broadened electives, college preparation and vocational pursuits (Zais, 1976, p. 33). However, the American curriculum reform movement stemmed from a broad population of concern. Public disfavour of the condition of schools and the courses of study had been piqued in a series of articles written by M. M. Rice in the popular turn-of-the century Forum Magazine (Cremin, 1964, p. 5; Shane, 1953, p. 405). These articles attacked heavy-handed authoritarianism and rote drill, while extolling the virtues of the "Progressive School" i.e. scientific evaluation, unified subjects, nature and social studies. No longer sufficient was the "common school" of Horace Mann and Henry Barnard that had in turn developed from Ben Franklin's 18th Century "Enlightenment" Academy (Caswell, 1950, p. 3).

In step with the Committees' recommendations of broadening the classical curriculum, Massachussets established the first public Normal School in 1895, which enabled teachers further education. In part, this expansion reflected American society's realization that their new industrial and economic order of rapidly increasing urbanity and complexity demanded a more extensive curriculum, available to all. Caswell quotes Washington's farewell address (Caswell and Campbell, 1935, p. 24): "In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be "enlightened". That is, the complex human interdependence of a democracy could only be

upheld in a widely responsive education that was pragmatic as well as being classical as the European tradition had been.

Nevertheless, European educators continued to make a great contribution to American curriculum thought in the late 1800's and early 1900's: Pestalozzi, Froebel, and then Montessori continued to influence American education with their characterization of the teacher as a caring guide, as well as through specific didactic curriculum materials. Herbert Spencer made a great impact on American education by emphasizing the hierarchal structuring of education toward kinds of life activities: citizenship, vocation, parenthood, survival and aesthetic refinement (Painter, 1970, Chapter 26). In an extended form, Spencer's ideas were revived in that bedrock curriculum document the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (Kingsley, 1918, pp. 10-11), wherein social progress is articulated in terms of citizenship.

In 1806 J. F. Herbart's conception of steps to learning anticipated much that was to become central in the curriculum movement in America. The steps consisted of 1. clarification of experience 2. association with what is already known 3. definitive systematization 4. method-toward practical application (Ulich, 1963, pp. 509-522). The man John Dewey thought of as the father of the Progressive Movement, Francis Parker, stated that Herbart's insights were: The best working hypothesis ever presented for the study of teachers" (Herbart Society, 1895, p. 155). Charles

De Garmo and Frank McMurry were American disciples of Herbart, and under their leadership the National Society for the Study of Education (first appellated the National Herbart Society) was founded.

The first psychological laboratory, established in Leipzig, Germany, by Wilhelm Wundt and Helmhotz, inspired American visitors such as G. Stanley Hall and Edward Thorndike. Hall zealously propounded an evolutionary perspective of education which acknowledged developmental stages of understanding in the student, and reached beyond rote memorization and strictly prescribed conformation of the curriculum. Hall's acknowledgement of the student's growing "apperceptive mass" of intelligent understanding was akin to the influential work of Ebbinghaus whose experiments in memory were passed along to American teachers by William James. Also, the "voluntarism" of James emphasized the will and the democracy of social change that he felt must correspond with the psychological respect of the individual (Cremin, 1964, Chapter 4; James, 1899, p. 141). Working under William James upon his return to America, Edward Thorndike studied the association processes of animals in 1898 and later published connectionist, stimulus-response (S-R) methodology. Such thinking discredited the mental muscle-building rationales of faculty psychology and opened the door to individualized instruction by acknowledging personal, developmental psychology (Caswell, 1950, pp. 13-14).

University-level study of curriculum began in 1895

in the United States, with Dewey's courses at the University of Chicago, which he continued at Teacher's College between 1905-1914; entitling his courses: "Evaluation of the Curriculum" and "Social Life and the School Curriculum" (Tanner, 1981, p. 414).

However the major restructuring and materialization that took place in American curriculum in the early 1900's was part of a larger social movement in the United States. Methods of science became accessible to salve ailing human affairs, dull mechanism was being rejected for an increasingly humanist perspective, The "Americanization" of the flood of immigrants to North America had to be addressed. The dynamic rush of land settlement, industry and politics demanded a curriculum beyond the stasis of the classics. The zeitgeist was progressive - "We can solve our problems!". Social efficiency movements spurred scientific analysis of activities in schools (i.e. Binet-Simon I.Q. tests) to decipher the growing complexity of the school population.

The school community had burgeoned not only from extensive immigration, but through extension of mandatory school-age, the abolition of child-labour, the extension of vocational education in schools and land-grant colleges, restrictive pressure against job-applicants by labour leaders, followed by compulsory school regulations (Conant, 1959b, p. 86; Kliebard, 1968, pp. 72-73). Concommitant with universal schooling, the field of education became

increasingly delimited to the study of schools, subject organization and teacher preparation. Normal schools, laboratory schools, and Teacher Institutes flourished to accommodate this focus for scholarship (Schaefer in McLure, 1971, pp. 4-24).

From the late 1800's up to the 1920's most additions to American curricula were in the form of texts, labs, gymnasia, as well as instruments for mathematics, the sciences, vocational education, and home economics. It would be fair to say that curricular endeavours, up to the 1920's typically materialized a greater quantity and wider scope of educational "staples" that were demanded by the great increase in school attendance. This materialization of curriculum was, nevertheless, accomplished with serious consideration to the broader educative horizon within which school curriculum was produced (Bobbitt, 1918, p. 43; 1941, p. 298).

The broad educative horizons of curriculum thought were strongly clarified in 1918. In that year the Progressive Education Association was formed simultaneous to the publication of Bobbitt's The Curriculum, Kilpatrick's The Project Method and the National Education Association's Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education.

While 1918 has been termed the year that curriculum became established as a "self-conscious field of study " (Kliebard, 1968, p. 71), it might be noted that each of the

landmark publications of that year highlighted a different commitment to education. Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education focused upon educational goals in the light of ethics, home-membership, vocation, health, citizenship and other social needs (Kingsley, 1918, pp. 10-11). The Project Method, in contrast focused upon the needs of the student, as seen in their guidance and the discovery of their purpose in classroom activities (Kilpatrick, 1918, pp. 322-323). On the other hand, Bobbitt's The Curriculum centered upon discipline-centred goals that were nevertheless drawn from an overview of human affairs (Bobbitt, 1924, pp. 3-4).

2. The 1920's to the 1940's.

During the 1920's, through the 1940's, curriculum-as-material was augmented by curriculum-as-experience. While new curriculum materials for elementary then secondary levels were produced voluminously, many educators remarked upon the poignancy of daily classroom life, and the vital nature of the "educational moment" (Kilpatrick, 1935, p. 7; Charters, 1923, p. 147; Rugg, 1927, pp. 19-20; Counts in Rugg, 1927, pp. 73-90; Caswell and Campbell, 1935, Chapter IV; Whitehead, 1932, pp. 70-75; Bode, 1937, p. 38; Taba, 1945, pp. 80-115). Progressive respect for individual worth and integrity of purpose was fused with advances in psychology which had uncovered developmental growth and physiological grounds for individual differences (Cremin, 1964, Chapter IV; Hopkins, 1937, Chapter 9). Curriculum planning was

acknowledged as a continuous process that demanded a broad base of committed maintenance by district administrators, publications personnel, teacher-educators, principals, and especially teachers (Harap, 1935, pp. 241-243; Alberty, 1947, pp. 422-432). The community atmosphere varied from optimistic research and experimentation of the 1920's, to austerity and caution of the 1930's and 40's, in Depression and War - yet the curriculum was firmly experience-centered, in addition to materially productive.

Before long educators were wondering how curriculum could correct the prevalence of serious crime, growing religious and racial intolerance, American isolationist tendencies, the dwindling representation of the humanities in the schools, and 'creeping materialism' - commercialization that was beginning to dominate the national philosophy (Bagley in Rugg, 1927, p. 38). In the cautionary atmosphere of the Depression, confidence in classical school subjects as such was sinking, as the needs for vocational education increased.

Generally, educators were recognizing their responsibilties to individual differences in students, amidst the great influx in the number of students attending schools. Teacher and student involvement in the numerous curriculum revisions was becoming increasingly realized as necessary. Not only were elective subjects offered in high schools, but a great deal of attention was given to defining "the core" of general education - knowledge, attitudes and skills firmly

ensconced within social purposes and individual needs (Schubert, 1980, pp. 99-106; Tyler in McLure, 1971, pp. 26-44).

In addition to societal pressure and the growing academic focus upon curriculum, the curriculum field was in part formulated from administrative needs within particular school districts. For example, Denver Superintendent Jesse Newlon appointed a district curriculum director in the early 1920's (Pinar and Grumet, 1980, p. 1). Moreover, large-scale national concerns previously cited by Bagley moved the academic community toward the clarification of priorities and directions in curriculum. The 26th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education portrayed the views of many of the educators who attempted to meet those concerns.

Harold Rugg, as chairman of the N.S.S.E. committee on curriculum that reported in the 26th Yearbook, wished to accomplish a complete revision of curriculum to throw off the education that imitated European realities. He criticized past National Committees for their strict alignment with subject matter and doctrines of discipline. He criticized "dynamic growth" activists for focusing so closely on the child that long range goals and social commitments became blurred. Thirdly, he criticized social scientists for their technical immersion in social needs, minimizing child growth (Rugg, 1927, Part II).

In the 1930's and 1940's, massive publically-funded

curriculum research projects were undertaken that aimed at both elementary and secondary school levels. In New York, 1939, 75,000 elementary children were involved in "activity programs", and were found to excel in their respect of the teacher, love of work and critical reading (Smith, 1957, pp. 396-398).

The Eight Year Study (1933-1941) involved thirty high schools from across the United States in innovative curriculum research programs. Although many of the findings of the Eight Year Study were highly significant, the impact of the study was disjointed by the Second World War. The commission involved in the Eight Year Study found major inadequacies in many American schools: lack of clear purposes, distinct from immediate objectives; faltering citizenship education; inadequate preparation for community life; little challenge for the intellectually gifted; little guidance counselling; stilted learning experiences (recitation, repetitive seatwork; underdeveloped humanities programs). Yet in the thirty experimental schools, the committee obtained academically and socially superior results (Aikin, 1942, pp. 4-10, conclusion). The many different innovative programs involved were developed from the committee's curriculum model based upon three fundamental perspectives: 1. adolescent needs approach 2. specialized subject-matter approach 3. social demands approach (Giles, McCutcheon and Zechiel, 1942, pp. 22-48).

Two members of the Eight Year Study went on to

carry the curriculum banner in educational writing. Hilda Taba was to write an influential synoptic text book, (Taba, 1945; Taba, 1962) while Ralph Tyler is considered to have realized a cohesive curriculum paradigm with the publication of his Milestone book Basic Principles of Curriculum an Instruction (1949). His Basic Principles portrays a systematic curriculum development model, that he claimed would evolve from four fundamental questions: 1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? 2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes? 3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? 4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? (Tyler, 1949, p. 1). The influence of Tyler's Basic Principles has been, and still is undeniably great among curricularists up till the present (Shane, 1981, pp. 311-314).

William Schubert maintains that Tyler advocates that school purposes should be derived from the learner, knowledge fields, and society, but that the emphasis on any one source can be "skewed". Further, this "skewing" of curricular direction can result in experientialism, intellectual traditionalism, or behaviourism (Tyler, 1949, pp. 5-33; Schubert, 1980, p. 16; Schubert, 1982, 425). Tyler's Rationale may derive its powerful influence from its emphasis on procedure linked to experience by purposes, as opposed to focusing on a static program or a set conceptual-

ization of a program. Many books that followed Tyler's were recipe - like in their detail of curriculum procedures and problems. Synoptic texts, of the "one book tells all" variety, soon flooded teacher education curriculum courses.

From the 1920's to the 1940's large-scale public concern and genuine interest in education spurred innumerable experiments in school curricula, teacher education, and in the philosophy of education. By 1932, educators' interest in curriculum had crystallized sufficiently to organize The Society for Curriculum Study which by 1943 merged with the N.E.A. to form the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

3. The 1950's.

The 1950's could be regarded as a "fallow" decade in curriculum. It has been described variously as a time of "consolidating gains" in an atmosphere of "consensus among educators" (Caswell, 1952, p. 95); or as a period of "un-committed, stagnant opinion" (Leeper, 1957, pp. 2-3). During this era, the baby-boom demanded material construction rather than curriculum reconstruction. In America, six times as many buildings arose to meet a 33% increase in students and six times as many teachers (McLure, 1971, pp. 45-54).

The publication of a number of synoptic texts portrayed curriculum as a body of literature that justified it as a field of study. And curriculum consultants, superintendents and directors were appointed, which marked the specialization of the field.

School de-segregation became viewed as necessary, and the thrust of general education became felt as did "life-adjustment" movements, and the "core curriculum" of interdisciplinary knowledge (N.E.A. 35th Yearbook, 1956; N.E.A. 32nd Yearbook, 1953). Also, the experimental use of audiovisual equipment and teaching machines mushroomed (Schubert, 1980, pp. 130-144). Yet storm-clouds were gathering that would soon dismiss attitudes either of consensus or stagnation among curricularists, for by 1957, Sputnik's success had shocked the public into a severely critical attitude toward the schools.

4. The 1960's

Public pressure for measured intellectual accomplishment corresponded with a bifurcation of curriculum endeavours in the 1960's. Curriculum-as-experience paled on the one hand to behavioural objectives and systems management approaches in schooling practices, and on the other hand toward growing understanding and respect for the structure of the disciplines.

Curricularists were taken to task in the 1960's for their inattention to the structure of the disciplines. The deterioration of the American economy at this time also fueled criticism of the schools. Jerome Bruner's The Process of Education, calling for respect of the disciplines, explained many of the conclusions reached by academics and scientists who were called to bolster the curriculum. Yet festering public concern for efficient schooling afforded a foothold

for programmatic organization of curriculum in behavioural terms (Mager, 1962; Popham, 1969). Respect for the subject fields (Goodlad, 1964, 1966 and 1967; Bruner, 1961 and 1966; Bestor, in Phenix, 1961) soon degenerated into rigid adherence to narrow conceptions of powerful learning theory of the day (Bloom, 1956).

The American population became increasingly mobile at the same time as international unrest engendered a technological arms race. The government responded to public demands for an increase in proficiency in the schools as well as equality of educational opportunity, by funding gargantuan curriculum revision projects through the Kettering, Ford, Carnegie and other Corporations (McLure, 1971, pp. 55-75). While the gap between theory and practise was being freshly addressed by the N.E.A., "teacher-proof" materials were being mass-produced by subsidiaries of funding corporations.

Numerous educators, like John Goodlad, had decried the educational compromises of the 1950's, and called for "spirited controversy", and "wholesome skepticism" about curriculum (Goodlad, 1957, p. 398). Yet later reflection on the large-scale reform efforts of the early 1960's caused Goodlad, for one, to lament that they hadn't developed effective means to influence content and pedagogy in teacher-colleges and universities, and thus did not provide for continuing self-renewal (Goodlad, 1964, p. 76).

Although theory about the development of the

student was insightfully explained psychologically by Piaget (Piaget, 1966) and later in moral terms by Kohlberg (Kohlberg, 1972, pp. 449-496), Schwab (1973) later observed that curriculum had then arrived at an unproductive condition because of a mistaken reliance on theory aimed toward the fixation of taxonomies and the clarification of comprehensive patterns. Instead, the practical was proferred as scholarly endeavour with a view to guiding possible action, decision-oriented. Schwab's insights were amplified throughout the educational community by popular critiques written by classroom teachers such as Holt (1964), Kozol (1967), Herndon (1968), Kohl (1967), Postman and Weingartner (1969).

At the same time, mechanistic attitudes were also understood to undermine the decision-making responsibilities of both local teachers and local administrators. Yet John Goodlad clearly realized that the conceptualization of curriculum development processes demanded recognition of at least three levels of responsibility: 1) instructional - the teacher and student relationship; 2) institutional - the administrators involved; 3) societal - government legislation (Goodlad and Richter, 1967, p. 7).

While many curriculum specialists concentrated on the production of pre-packaged curriculum, growing respect for the vitality of the subject fields was short circuited by one-sided government funding for the "hard" sciences, coupled with their summative evaluation of many unsustained projects.

Increasingly in the 1960's, curriculum theory became understood as an application of behavioural science, empirically rather than philosophically grounded (Schubert, 1980 pp. 172-194; Tyler, 1970, pp. 45-46). By the end of the 1960's, Joseph Schwab had classified the curriculum field as generally "moribund" (Schwab, 1978a, p. 287, originally 1969).

5. The 1970's.

In contrast with the behavioural positivism that had begun to frame the field, the theme of human values in curriculum interfused much of the curriculum writing of the 1970's. This deep commitment to human values arose in opposition to the 1960's large-scale "top-down" curriculum practices that had mass-produced material and minimized the existence of experiential free-choice. Schwab's "practical" (1969, 1973), Walker's "deliberation" (1971, 1975), Macdonald's "underlying human interests" (1975), Huebner's "just environment" (1975), Stenhouse's "cultural cultivation" (1970, 1975), and Cronbach's "decision-oriented inquiry" (1969, 1977) all voiced the importance of reflective human values in curriculum.

Yet, curriculum studies as a recognized sub-discipline of education almost met its demise with the advent of the 1970's. Teacher-education programs shrank as students chose other careers in reaction to the oversupply of teachers in the schools. Also, curriculum project funds dwindled in

the face of a deteriorating American economy. In addition, disciplinary specialists such as psychologists and sociologists were increasingly chosen to teach education courses over those with a Ph.D. or Ed.D. in Education. These pressures were particularly threatening to fledgling curriculum departments in universities (Pinar and Grumet, 1980, pp. 13-14).

Amid student protest movements, and civil-rights marches, many curriculum scholars began to accentuate curricular change in terms of culture rather than less appropriate natural-science models, technical, or narrowly political views (Purpel and Belanger, 1972; House 1979, pp. 137-149; Giroux, Penna and Pinar, 1981). Strikingly, the first major retrospective publication on curriculum since the 1926 yearbook of the N.S.S.E. was published in 1971. Entitled The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect, the publication challenged curricularists of the 1970's to engineer a wide variety of educational approaches and to generate alternative educational forms. It concluded with the prospect that: "He (the curriculum worker) will lead the society to the discovery of humanistic institutions in which bureaucratic routine is anaethema and self-discovery and cooperative action are de rigeur." (Joyce in McLure, 1971, p. 355). Correspondingly, the 1970 Yearbook of the A.S.C.D. was entitled To Nurture Humaneness: Commitment of the 70's.

The curriculum scholars of the 1970's demanded

critical reflection upon education. Paul Klohr (1971) noted the "Greening of Curriculum" with the then increasing acknowledgement of a political context in curriculum making, as well as the reconceptualization of curriculum design, and the multiplication of new roles for students and teachers in their community. Klohr's concluding paragraph emphasized the growing awareness of values that was to characterize curricular concerns in the 1970's: "...I am convinced that we must keep in mind, more than ever before, that values are quite central in this process of curriculum development." (Klohr, 1971, p. 457).

A catalytic conference was organized by William Pinar in Rochester in 1973 that invigorated the curriculum field with reconceptualist scholarship and at the same time warned that education should not be mechanically divorced from its historical, political and creative roots. Shortly thereafter, Huebner outlined five value frameworks that underly curriculum decision-making: technical, political, scientific, aesthetic, and ethical values (Huebner, 1975, p. 14). He also stressed the role of the teacher in taming "the incipient chaos" of the classroom and the role of the student "in participating in the making of his own knowledge" (Huebner, 1975, pp. 24,25). Macdonald, working with Zaret and Wolfson also expressed value directives: that schools aim to develop autonomous humans; that school personalize, not standardize curriculum; that school decision-making be

participatory, not authoritative (Macdonald, 1973, pp. 5-7).

Michael Apple has asked us to look more carefully at the living process of education rather than weighing "culture products" and extending hegemony in the school (Apple in Willis, 1978, p. 495; Apple, 1979), while Maxine Greene anticipates a humanist "network of relationships" in her existential view of schooling (Greene, 1975, 1978). Decker Walker has outlined a "naturalistic model" of curriculum development that is oriented to practical decision-making and consists of: the curriculum developers' platform of values and beliefs, the design of theoretical requirements, and the deliberation, or human judgment of alternatives (Walker, 1971, pp. 51-69). Elliot Eisner has broadened curriculum research with his notion of "connoiseurship", as well as noting the existence of both an explicit and implicit curriculum (Eisner, 1979, p. 74, 1980, pp. 373-374).

Lawrence Stenhouse, William Reid, Barry MacDonald, Malcolm Parlett and David Hamilton also contributed to intensive curricular field study in England, culminating in "illuminative research" and advocating the central role of the teacher in research (Stenhouse, 1980, pp. 40-44; Stenhouse, 1975; Hamilton et al, 1977, Section 1 and Section 4). McCutcheon has made similar studies in Ohio (McCutcheon, 1979, pp. 5-25). Paulo Freire's pedagogy through social action has drawn curricularist's attention to the "cultural capital" gained through learning, and has explained discrepancies that can exist in varying ethnic and political

milieus (Freire, 1970). Freire has also described the vitalrole of leadership in forming a "cultural circle" (Freire, 1971).

It is interesting to note that only between 1968 and 1980 has Educational Leadership (named Curriculum Journal before 1943) been augmented by other curriculum journals. First, Curriculum Theory Network (now Curriculum Inquiry) was established at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in 1968; then The Journal of Curriculum Studies in England in 1969; then in 1978 The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing and Papers for the Study of Curriculum History in the United States and Curriculum Perspectives in 1980, in Australia. All of these journals have, more or less consistently, aimed toward a constructive synthesis of theory and practice.

To reiterate, curriculum has undergone five major shifts in meaning from the 1890's through the 1970's:

1. The 1890's until about 1920 saw the materialization of curriculum taking place in response to societal and scholarly pressure to expand the scope of the classical curriculum to include pragmatic and scientific concerns. This resulted in the rapid expansion of curriculum texts, gyms, vocational and home economic workshops and laboratories.

2. The 1920's through the 1940's inclusive, wherein the material expansion of curriculum was augmented by

curriculum as experience. This was evident in a wide range of curricular writing and curricular action: from the poignancy of the "educational moment" of daily class life to development of the individual in psychological and physiological terms. Through two World Wars, there was naturally a strong emphasis and respect for democracy in the mini-community of the classroom - the curriculum was firmly experienced-centered.

3. The fallow period of the 1950's has been variously defined as a time of stagnation or a time of consolidating gains in the field of curriculum.

4. The 1960's saw a bifurcation of curriculum endeavours. Curriculum as experience changed paled on the one hand to behavioural objectives and systems management and on the other hand to a growing respect for the structure of the disciplines.

5. In the 1970's high priority was characteristically given to re-affirming the pivotal nature of values in curriculum, wherein the curriculum is reflectively mediated by the teacher. Curricularists have thus discredited the "remote-control" implementation of "teacher-proof" programs.

REFERENCES

Aiken, Wilford M. (1942) The story of the eight year study. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Alberty, Harold. (1947) Recognizing the high school curriculum. New York: Macmillan.

Apple, Michael. (1978) Ideology and form in curriculum evaluation in (Ed.) George Willis Qualitative Evaluation. New York: McCutcheon Publishing Co.

Apple, Michael. (1979) Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ashton, Patricia et al. (1982) An account of the D.E.A. Open University report. British Journal of Inservice Education, Autumn.

Bagley, W. C. (1927) The foundations of curriculum making, 26th Yearbook of the N.S.S.E. (Ed.) Harold Rugg, Part I, Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co.

Bloom, Benjamin et al. (1956) Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook I: the cognitive domain. New York: Longmans Green and Co.

Bobbitt, Franklin. (1918) The Curriculum. Boston Houghton Mifflin.

Bobbitt, Franklin. (1924) How to Make a Curriculum. Cambridge Riverside Press.

Bobbitt, Franklin. (1941) The curriculum of modern education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.

Bode, Boyd. (1937) Modern Educational theories. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Bode, Boyd. (1939) Democracy as a way of life. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Bruner, Jerome S. (1961) The process of education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, Jerome S. (1966) Towards a theory of instruction Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burke, G. (1980) Experienced teachers' perceptions and preferences concerning off-campus University courses and school-district sponsored inservice education activities in the Province of Alberta. University of Alberta, Unpublished thesis.

Caswell, Hollis L. and Campbell, Doak S. (1935) Curriculum development. New York: American Book Co.

Caswell, Hollis. (1950) Curriculum improvement in public school systems. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia University.

Caswell, Hollis. (1952) Postwar trends in curriculum development, National Education Association Journal, vol. 41, 2, pp. 93-95.

Charters, W. W. (1923) Curriculum construction. New York: MacMillan Co.

Clark, Christopher and Yinger, Bob (1979) Research on teacher planning, Journal of Curriculum Studies, vol. 11, 2, pp. 175-179.

Conant, James Bryant (1959) The child, the parent and the state. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Connelly, F. M. and Ben Peretz, M. (1980) Teacher roles in the using and doing of research and curriculum development. Journal of Curriculum Studies, vol. 12, 2, pp. 95-109.

Connelly, F. Michael et al (Ed., 1980) Curriculum planning for the classroom. Toronto: O.I.S.E. Press.

Cooper, Harris and Good, Thomas. (1983) Pygmalion grows up. New York: Longman Inc.

Counts, George S. (1932) Dare the school build a new social order? New York: John Day Publishers.

Cremin, Lawrence. (1964) The transformation of the school. New York: Vintage Books.

Cronbach, Lee J. and Snow, Richard E. (1977) Aptitudes and instructional methods. New York: Irvington, Publishers Inc.

Cronbach, Lee J. and Suppes, Patrick (Ed., 1969) Research for tomorrow's schools: disciplined inquiry for education. Toronto: The MacMillan Co.

Dewey, John. (1956) The child and the curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; originally printed in 1902.

Edelfelt, Roy A. and Smith, E. B. (1978) Breakaway to multidimensional approaches. Washington, D. C.: Association of Teacher Educators.

Eisner, Elliot. (1979) The educational imagination: on the design and evaluation of school programs. New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, Elliot. (1980) Toward a conceptual revolution in evaluation. Educational Forum, vol. 44, March pp. 373-374.

Fenstermacher, Gary D. (1967) Need-achievement theory and educational practice: a transformation. Philosophy of Education, 1967. Proceedings of the 23rd annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, (Ed.) D. B. Gowin, pp. 76-83.

Finlay, Audrey J. (1978) Designing an inservice program. Unpublished Master's Thesis: University of Alberta.

Flinn, Jane Z. (1982) Curriculum change through staff development in Educational Leadership. Vol. 40, 1, pp. 51-52.

Freire, Paulo. (1970) Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder.

Freire, Paulo. (1971) A circular: to the coordinator of a cultural circle. Convergence, 10(1), pp. 53-57.

Fritz, John O. (1981) The teacher in curriculum reform. Kenneth Leithwood and Andrew Hughes (Ed.) Curriculum Canada III: Curriculum Research and Development and Critical Student Outcomes. Vancouver, B.C.: University of B. C., Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, pp. 111-131.

Fullan, Michael. (Winter 1977) Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research. vol. 47, 1.

Fullan, Michael, Pomfret, A.(Winter, 1977) Research on curriculum and instruction. Review of Educational Research. 47, 2.

Giles, H. H., McCutcheon, S. P., Zechiel, A. N. (1942) Exploring the curriculum. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Giroux, Henry A., Penna, Anthony N., Pinar, William F. (Ed.) (1981) Curriculum and instruction. Berkley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Good, Thomas and Brophy, Jere (1978) Looking in classrooms. New York: Harper and Row Co.

Goodlad, John I. (1957) Guest Editorial. Educational Leadership, A.S.C.D., vol. XIV, 7, pp. 397-398.

Goodlad, John I. (1964) School curriculum reform in the United States. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Goodlad, John I. and Richter, Maurice N. Jr. (1967) The development of a conceptual system for dealing with problems of curriculum and instruction. Los Angeles: Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, University of California.

Goodlad, John I., Stoephasius, Renata von, Klein, M. Frances (1966) The changing school curriculum. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Gough, Robert G. (1977) Curriculum development and teacher education British Journal of Inservice Education, Volume 3, #3, p. 218.

Greene, Maxine. (1975) Curriculum and consciousness. (Ed.) W. Pinar, Curriculum Theorizing. New York: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Hamilton, David et al. (1977) Beyond the numbers game. London: Macmillan.

Harap, Henry. (1935) The technique of curriculum making. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Heckman, Paul E. (1983) Expanding the concepts of school renewal and change. Educational Leadership. Vol. 40, 7, pp. 26-32.

Herbart Society. (1895) First yearbook of the Herbart society for scientific study of teaching.

Herndon, James. (1968) The way it spozed to be. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Herrick, Virgil E. Tyler, Ralph, W. (1950) Toward improved curriculum theory. The School Review. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Number 71, March.

Holt, John. (1964) How Children Fail. New York: Pitman Publishers.

Hopkins, L. Thomas. (1937) Integration, its meaning and application. New York: C. Appleton Century Publications.

House, Ernest R. (1979) Technology versus craft: a ten year perspective on innovation. (Ed.) Philip H. Taylor, New Directions in Curriculum Studies. London: The Falmer Press.

House, E., Lapan, S. (1978), Survival in the classroom. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Huebner, Dwayne. (1966) Curriculum as a field of study. Helen F. Robison, (Ed.) Precedents and Promise in the Curriculum Field, Columbia Univeristy: Teacher's College Press.

Huebner, Dwayne. (1975) Curricular language and classroom meanings. (Ed.) W. Pinar, Curriculum Theorizing: the Reconceptualists. Berkley: McCutchan.

James, William. (1899) Talks to teachers on psychology. New York: Henry-Holt and Co.

Joyce, Bruce; and Weil, Marsha. (1972) Models of teaching. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Kennedy, William Bean. (Fall 1981) Highlander praxis: learning with Myles Horton. Teacher's College Record, vol. 83, 1, Fall pp. 105-119.

Kingsley, Clarence D. (1918) The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, Bulletin, number 35; National Education Association Commission, Washington, D. C. Bureau of Education.

Kilpatrick, William Heard. (1918) The project method. Teacher's College Record, vol. 19, 4, pp. 319-335.

Kilpatrick, William Heard. (1935) Foundations of method. New York: MacMillan Co.

Kliebard, H. M. (1968) The curriculum field in retrospect. (Ed.) P. W. Witt, Technology and the Curriculum. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Klohr, Paul. (1971) The greening of curriculum Educational Leadership vol. 28, February.

Kohl, Herbert. (1967) 36 children. New York: New American Library.

Kohlberg, L. and Mayer, R. Development as the aim of education. Harvard Educational Review, 1972, 42, 4, 449-496.

Kozol, Jonathan. (1967) Death at an early age. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Leeper, Robert. (1957) Editorial, Educational Leadership. A.S.C.D., vol. XV, 1, pp. 2-3.

Leithwood, K. (1981) The dimensions of curriculum innovation. Journal of Curriculum Studies, vol. 13, 1, pp. 25-36.

Leithwood, K. (1983) Graduate curriculum studies with a focus on curriculum processes. Curriculum Inquiry, 13:1, pp. 65-83.

Lortie, Dan C. (1975) Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Macdonald, James B., Wolfson, Bernice J., Zaret, Esther. (1973) Reschooling society: a conceptual model. Washington, D. C.: A.S.C.D.

Macdonald, James B. (1975) The quality of everyday life in schools. (Ed.) J. Macdonald and E. Zaret, A.S.C.D. Yearbook, Schools in Search of Meaning. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McCabe, C. (1980) Evaluating inservice training for teachers. Windsor: NFER Publications.

McClure, Robert M. (1971) The curriculum: retrospect and prospect. The 70th Yearbook of the N.S.S.E., Part I, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCutcheon, Gail. (1979) Educational criticism: methods and application. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 1:2.

Mager, R. F. (1962) Preparing objectives for programmed instruction. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers Inc.

Melvin, A. Gordon. (1936) The activity program. New York: Roynal and Hitchcock.

Miel, Alice. (1946) Changing the curriculum: a social process. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts Inc.

National Education Association Commission. (1918) (Chairman) Clarence D. Kingsley. Bulletin, 1918, Number 35, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Education.

National Education Association. (1953) 32nd Yearbook. Science for today's children. Washington, D.C., vol. 33, 1.

Oberg, Antoinette. (1980) Implications of curriculum decisions by teachers for curriculum making. (Ed.) Jean-Jacques Bernier and George S. Tomkins, Curriculum Canada II. Vancouver, B.C.: Center for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, pp. 54-65.

Olson, John K. (1980) Teacher constructs and curricular change. Journal of Curriculum Studies. Vol. 12, 1, pp. 1-11.

Painter, V.F.N. (1970) Great pedagogical essays. New York: A.M.S. Press.

Phenix, Philip H. (1964) Realms of Meaning. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Piaget, J. (1966) Genetic epistemology. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pinar, William F., Grumet, Madeleine R. (1980) Theory and practice and the reconceptualization of curriculum studies. (Ed.) L. Barton and M. Lawn, Self and Structure. Birmingham: Westhill College.

Popham, W. J. (1969) Objectives and instruction. Instructional Objectives. A.E.R.A. Monograph series on curriculum and evaluation, Number 3, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.

Postman, Neil, Weingartner, Charles. (1969) Teaching as a subversive activity. New York: Delacorte Press.

Purpel, D., Belanger, N. (1972) (Ed.) Curriculum and the cultural revolution. Berkley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Redknap, Christopher (1977) Focus on teacher's centers. Berkshire: NFER Publishing.

Reid, William A. (1978) Thinking about the curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Rugg, Harold (Ed., 1927). The foundations of curriculum making: 26th yearbook of the N.S.S.E., Part II. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co.

Russell, Earl B. (Fall 1975) Upgrading curricula through change-oriented teachers in Theory to Practise. pp. 27-31.

Schiro, Michael. (1978) Curriculum for better schools. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.

Schools Council. (1970) Teachers' Centres and the Changing Curriculum, pamphlet #6. London: Schools Council Publications.

Schubert, William. (1980) Curriculum books, the first 80 years. Lanham, M.D.: University Press.

Schubert, William. (1982) Curriculum research. (Ed.) Harold E. Mitzel, The Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: The Free Press.

Schwab, Joseph. (1973) The practical: translation into curriculum. School Review, 81, 1973, pp. 501-522.

Schwab, Joseph J. (1978) The practical, translation into curriculum. (Ed.) Ian Westbury and Neil J. Wilkof Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Shane, Harold G. (1953) The American elementary school. The 13th Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Harper Bros.

Shane, Harold G. (1981) Significant writings that have influenced curriculum, 1906-1981. Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 62, pp. 311-314.

Short, Edmund. (1983) The use of a curriculum development strategies matrix. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 15: 2, pp. 212-214.

Smith, Othanel B., Stanley, William O., & Shores, J. Harlan. (1957) Fundamentals of curriculum development. New York: World Book Co.

Smyth, John (1982) A teacher-development approach to bridging the practice/research gap. Journal of Curriculum Studies, vol. 14, 4, pp. 331-342.

Stenhouse, Lawrence. (1970) Controversial value-issues in the classroom. (Ed.) William G. Carr, Values and the Curriculum, a Report of the 4th International Curriculum Conference. Washington, D.C.: N.E.A.

Stenhouse, Lawrence. (1975) An introduction to curriculum research and development. London: Heinemann.

Stenhouse, Lawrence. (1980, Ed.) Curriculum research and development in action. London: Heinemann.

Strike, Kenneth A. (1979) An epistemology of practical research. Educational Researcher, vol. 8, 11, pp. 10-16.

Taba, Hilda. (1962) Curriculum development: theory and practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Taba, Hilda. (1945) General techniques of curriculum planning. (Ed.) Ralph Tyler, American Education in the Postwar Period: 44th Yearbook of the N.S.S.E.; Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tanner, Daniel. (1981) Curriculum history. The Encyclopedia of Educational Research, N.Y.: The Free Press, vol. 1.

Torgunrud, E. A. (1974) Foreward in (Ed.) J. Blaney, I. Housego, & G. Macintosh, Program Development in Education. Vancouver B.C.: Education Extension Center for Continuing Education, The University of British Columbia.

Tyler, Louise. (1970) A selected guide to curriculum literature: an annotated bibliography. Washington, D.C.: N.E.A.

Tyler, Ralph W. (1949) Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ulich, Robert. (1963) Three thousand years of educational wisdom. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Walker, Decker (November, 1971) A naturalistic model for curriculum development. The School Review, vol. 80, 1, pp. 51-65.

Walker, Decker & Reid, William A. (1975) Case studies in curriculm change. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Whitehead, Alfred North. (1932) The aims of education. London: Norgate and Williams Ltd.

Wood, Fred H. and Thompson, Stephen (1980) Guidelines for better staff development. Washington: A.S.C.D.

Zais, R. S. (1976) Curriculum, principles and foundations. New York: Harper and Row.

APPENDIX II

A Chronology of the Integration of Curriculum and Inservice Teacher Development

The Changing Meaning of Curriculum		Evolving Inservice Practices
1890-1920:	Materialization of Curriculum -in the expansion of subjects and population.	1890-1920: Teacher Institutes and Classroom intervisiting (to inspire and enhance subject competence)
1920-1940:	Curriculum as Experience -sensitivity to childrens' classroom life with psychological philosophical, and sociological insights.	1920-1940: Summer School at the Normals; reading circles, evening extension courses, classroom Supervision, correspondence courses.
1950 :	Fallow period -of consolidation or stagnation	1950 : Action research workshops
1960 :	Bifurcated curriculum -systems management -respect for the structure of the disciplines	1960 : deficit oriented supervision
1970 :	Values in Curriculum	1970 : Teacher centers are established Inservice teacher education research matures.

1980

Curriculum and Inservice Teacher Development becomes integrated as personal and organizational aims are amalgamated.

APPENDIX III

Kinds of Inservice Teacher Education

Institutes-	Conventions with invited inspirational or subject-specific speakers; one to three days in duration; attendance mandatory.
Reading Circles-	cooperative groups of teachers, formed under a provincial teacher's association or state department of education; approved booklists were read, discussed and reaction papers written; semi-voluntary, sometimes involving certificate renewal.
Summer School-	involved general study courses and Education courses; some coursework demanded by superintendents - most voluntary.
Supervision-	often aimed at correcting teacher's defects in knowledge or methods; usually at elementary level or by principal in high schools, mandatory.
Classroom observations/ Demonstrations-	teachers intervisit one another's classrooms, to focus constructively upon areas of strength; voluntary.
Workshops-	teachers work together with a curriculum director and resource people to improve and update curriculum; usually voluntary.
Action Research-	undertaken by practising teachers to focus on concrete problems; discussions, dispersal of findings about methodological solutions; voluntary.
Teacher Centers-	local organizational centers, usually outside the school itself, where curriculum is developed and creative methods are communicated and diffused; voluntary.